

purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, may be donated to local school agencies; Committee on Banking and Currency discharged, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2513. A bill to increase the compensation of the Governors of Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2514. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1945, by changing the basis of award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System from 2 years of service to 1 year of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2515. A bill to promote on the retired list officers and enlisted personnel of the Army commended for gallantry in the performance of duty in actual combat in World War I or II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2516. A bill to authorize the erection of additional facilities at the existing Veterans' Administration facility, Fort Miley, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 2517. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2518. A bill to extend the time within which application for the benefits of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 may be made by veterans discharged from the armed forces before the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2519. A bill to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2520. A bill to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office and to amend section 4934 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2521. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2522. A bill to provide certain limitations on penalties or liabilities arising out of Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and certain other acts, when the violations on which such penalties or liabilities were incurred were not willful; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2523. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2524. A bill to provide for the succession to the Presidency, and to provide for a person to act as President in case of the failure to qualify of both President-elect and Vice-President-elect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2525. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the

inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2526. A bill to increase the amount of deduction allowed with respect to medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2527. A bill to remove the monthly maximum placed on the income of veterans receiving both compensation for productive labor and subsistence allowances for education; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed in St. Louis, Mo., as the John J. Cochran Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 143. Resolution directing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct an investigation with respect to (1) the exclusion of Negroes as patrons of the public portions of the restaurants and cafeterias in the United States Government buildings in the District of Columbia, and (2) the exclusion of Negro employees as patrons of the restaurants and cafeterias in the United States Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Anastasio A. Ylagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 2529. A bill to suspend deportation of Domenico Marrazzo and record his admission for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Jeannette C. Jones and minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Wexler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2533. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2534. A bill for the relief of James H. Underwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

184. By Mr. MILLER of California: Petition of Board of Supervisors of Contra Costa County, State of California, urging defeat of any measures interfering with the basic democratic rights of the people of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

185. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Pittsburg, Calif., urging defeat of any measures which might interfere with the basic democratic rights of the people of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

186. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of residents of Odessa, Tex., asking abolition of OPA; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

187. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pastor del Rio, chairman of the democratic committee of the house of representatives, Habana, Cuba, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to an organization of a conference of representatives of the American legislative bodies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Great is the Lord and greatly to be praised; with rapture we meditate upon Thy measureless mercy. So long as there is a sun to drive away the darkness; so long as there is a bird to sing away the sadness of the human heart; so long as there is a wanderer wearing the scarred image of the Father, so long is there a redeeming love in the heart of our world's Saviour.

O Light Divine, our way is dim, uncertain, and perilous. We beseech Thee, these fateful days, to light up the plains of peace; to hover over this sin-wrought earth, struggling to be free because of distrust, ignorance, and low ambitions. Whatever is done in this Chamber, grant that those God-given rights—the right to live and work, the right of self-assertion, the right to worship—may be upheld. O safeguard us that we may never forfeit these blessings, which were wrought by sacrifice, toil, and death.

With Thy presence, Lord, O Thou bless our President; keep him in the circle of divine love and care, and restore him in rest to his urgent duties. In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WILEY, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. EASTLAND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1968) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he expected to make later in the day on House Resolution 76 and to include therein certain tables.

Mr. COFFIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial by John S. Knight that appeared in the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, March 9.

Mr. LEA (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER WITHDRAWN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for today may be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRACY MUST TAKE A STAND

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it has been truly said that politics make strange bedfellows, but never has the same political quilt covered such a diversified lot of statesmen as those who are today appearing out of the clearing mists of the speech delivered on the floor of this House yesterday. Those who subscribe in humble fealty to the Kremlin line and those who retch and gag at the very suggestion of Communist doctrine have linked arms in some of the most ludicrous pairings ever suggested by the mind of living mortal.

The President yesterday tiptoed through the tulips of diplomacy without crushing a tender blossom of Soviet sensibility. We can well imagine that Mr. Chamberlain's vulnerable umbrella is somewhere being dusted off for another jaunt to Armageddon, to a belated Munich, where this Nation, speaking gently in a tornado of human passion, will continue to follow the practice of crucifying the hopes and aspirations of free men and women upon the cross of our timidity in the face of decision.

Somewhere we must take a stand and assert our belief in democratic processes as opposed to the strangulation of freedom. I, for one, prefer to take that stand in Istanbul or Athens, rather than in Charleston, Newark, or San Francisco. The noose is drawing tighter, Mr. Speaker. Soon there may not be room to insert restraining fingers between the hemp and our throats.

But let us place the issue before the American people on the basis of the one issue: Democracy or communism—our form or another. There is no other question.

THE ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL ACT

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the Seventy-ninth Congress made a mistake in passing the Atomic Energy Control Act. I am today introducing a bill to repeal that act and place atomic energy back in the War Department, where it belongs. In view of the new world emergency, it is my belief that the secrets and the control of the atom bomb and energy can best be guarded by the Military Establishments.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION
BUNGLING

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there is a good deal of criticism about the way the War Assets Administration runs its business. Today I have an example of their business methods that tells the story in a nutshell and explains why this Administration is the object of so much criticism.

An industrial firm in my district was asked to bid on a certain lot of goods in Ohio on the 10th of October 1946.

On the 7th of November they sent three men to Columbus, Ohio, to inspect and appraise the goods.

On the 20th of November they sent in a bid.

On the 13th of December they were notified their bid had been accepted; and they made preparation to handle the material.

Now, on the 3d of March, 3 months later, they are notified that the material has been withdrawn from sale.

God help the country as long as our business is operated by such fellows as run the War Assets Administration. I understand War Assets has taken on thousands of employees from the OPA. Maybe this accounts for this kind of business.

The withdrawal of this goods may be in conformity with War Assets policy, but it is still poor business. And why 3 months to make up their minds? Maybe by good business methods War Assets could sell surplus property to better advantage.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include short editorials.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table today and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE LATE WALTER S. GOODLAND

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the people of Wisconsin are sad today because of the death of the grand old man of Wisconsin, Gov. Walter S. Goodland.

Walter Goodland was born on a farm in Sharon, Wis., in December 1862. Had he lived until next December he would have been 85 years of age.

Governor Goodland has been Governor of Wisconsin for the past 4 years. He was a man who stood at all times on the principles of the Golden Rule. He was a man of the people. His every thought was in the interest of the people. He was not impressed by pressure groups of any kind. If legislation were for the good of the people of the State of Wisconsin Governor Goodland was for it. If in his opinion the legislation was good only for certain special interests and not for the good of the people as a whole Governor Goodland could be counted on being against it.

He preached the principles of the Sermon on the Mount and practiced them as Governor of the State of Wisconsin. The principles as practiced by Governor Goodland in public office might well be emulated by every man in public office today.

In the death of Walter Goodland the people of Wisconsin have lost a true friend.

COMMUNIST IMPERTINENCE

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, apparently the American Communists consider

that they are the sole repositories of all wisdom and that through some form of cultural osmosis that wisdom emanates from each small cell in their set-up.

Hardly had President Truman finished speaking yesterday—and I know that many Members here in Congress are still pondering what will be the answer—when a Communist group from my congressional district, I am sorry to state, sent me a telegram and in dogmatic terms said that the Greek people have an undemocratic government; also, they make the accusation in the telegram that President Truman has betrayed the American people. I do not agree with everything that my President says and comes forward with, but, believe me, I would think 10 times—yes; a hundred times—before I would accuse him of betraying the American people, as these Communists do.

SURPLUS PROPERTY FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the membership knows that the Comptroller General has just issued a ruling to the effect that the RFC can no longer use any of its funds for exercising its statutory priority to obtain surplus property on behalf of small business.

This is not in accordance with the intent and purpose of the Congress, and I sincerely trust that prompt action will be had to see to it that the will of this Congress is carried out. Without such prompt action on our part, small business will have little further chance to purchase War Assets materials at terms possible to them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of official business, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBY] may be granted leave of absence for today and tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY AND WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE ARMY

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business before the House is the bill (H. R. 1943) to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the member from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this most excellent bill. It is a bill which comes, I understand, from the committee, with unanimous support of all members of that committee, and is, therefore, a bipartisan bill, a bill which provides something which we have always needed and that is a permanent Nursing Corps.

I have just one objection which I will present later in the form of an amendment. I would like to say that in presenting this amendment I feel that it is not due to the fact that the committee intentionally left it out. I merely believe that it was due to the fact that the proper organizations did not come before the committee and present it. My proposed amendment is identical with the amendment which was offered on this floor exactly 2 years ago by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. CLARENCE BROWN. Exactly 2 years ago, on March 6, 1945, the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN offered an amendment to the bill which was then called the draft nurses bill. Those of us who were here then will remember that our late President and Commander in Chief, Mr. Roosevelt, urged us to pass a bill so that we could draft nurses. We needed them in the conduct of the war, and the Honorable CLARENCE BROWN introduced an amendment at that time which is identical with the one which I will introduce, saying that in the drafting of nurses, in bringing nurses into the Army and the Navy, there should be no discrimination on account of creed, race, color, or national origin.

We all agree with the amendment to be offered here, because an identical amendment passed the House on March 6, 1945, unanimously, without division, without tellers; and then when the bill came before us the next day for final passage that amendment was still in it, and that bill was passed. The vote on that day, I think, was about three-hundred-and-something to forty-odd—I forget the exact number; I have it before me here. This is something we already agreed on 2 years ago, and I am sure you Republicans, especially, have not changed.

I would like to say that this proposed amendment, providing that nurses shall be included in our permanent Nurse Corps, without regard to race, creed, or color, is not set up on a quota basis; it does not force the appointment of a certain number. It merely gives the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, an opportunity to see that people of our Nation, loyal, qualified female citizens, regardless of race, creed, or color, shall be included in the permanent Nursing Corps.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman include a provision in there that they shall not be discriminated against because of membership in or lack of membership in a union?

Mr. POWELL. No; I do not do that. Mr. HOFFMAN. Why not?

Mr. POWELL. Well, if the gentleman wants to do that, let him introduce it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, why do you not?

Mr. POWELL. I will talk to the gentleman after my speech, and maybe we can get together on it.

Now, I would like to say that an identical amendment went through unanimously once before and there was no objection raised, and my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PAGE] was in the chair as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and all of us voted in favor of it. I am sure we want a permanent nursing corps which will include all American citizens, and this is a guaranty that all will be included.

May I remind you that the President has the right to appoint them with the advice and consent of the Senate. May I also say that until this amendment was passed 2 years ago the Navy had not appointed a single Negro nurse, despite the fact that we needed 6,000 then and 9,000 were ready. But after it was passed by us unanimously, the Navy did appoint Negro women to the nursing corps of the Navy and they served in combat. In the language of the American Red Cross, and I read from the History of the American Red Cross:

Negro nurses were assigned to general wards, and they were serious-minded, quiet, and businesslike young women.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Armed Services brings before the House today H. R. 1943, a bill to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army. This act is to be known as the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947. It is presented to you by MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Congresswoman from the Second District of Maine, and chairman of Subcommittee No. 9 on Hospitalization, Health—Medical Corps. The committee has made a most exhaustive study of the whole situation of nursing as it applies to our services.

This is a combination of two bills—H. R. 1673, which, through the courtesy of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, was introduced by myself, H. R. 1673, proposing to revise the Medical Department of the Army, and for other purposes—and a similar bill for the Navy introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

A very careful study has been made by the subcommittee of the history and the functions of these services. Under the able leadership of the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] practically all differences between the services have been harmonized. Do not let yourselves be confused by the language contained in the two titles. You will find that

there is a difference, but the facts and the conclusions are the same.

H. R. 1943 brings to a final conclusion the efforts made over a long period of years to give commissioned status to the nurses of the Army and the Navy, and latterly to the newer groups to be known as the Women's Medical Specialist Corps—dietitians, physical therapists, and occupational therapists—all of whom are now a recognized and necessary part of the Army medical set-up. Starting as civilian employees, these women were given a military status for World War II.

Thanks to Col. Florence Blanchfield, Superintendent of the Army Nurse Corps, and the outstanding ability and devotion she demonstrated to duty by her precept and example in inspiring the Army Nurse Corps during this last war, the nurses have had an opportunity to do extraordinary work. Established in 1901 with 400 Spanish-American War veterans, the Army Nurse Corps grew until in World War II the Army had about 60,000 nurses in uniform.

When one remembers that the first nurses who went in on D-4 going over the sides of the ships, working shoulder-to-shoulder with the doctors, there are no words with which to express one's gratitude and appreciation.

The Navy Nursing Corps was founded by act of Congress in May 1908 with 20 nurses. In the First World War the corps reached a capacity of 1,490. In the Second World War the capacity was increased to 11,086. There are now 2,300 members enrolled.

I would like to make special mention at this moment, of certain nurses new to the service: the Negro nurse group. My memory is that there were some 600 in all. I, myself, reviewed the first group in England after they finished their orientation. I followed them with a great deal of interest. They have done splendid work.

It seems to me that if there is one bill where we are justified in omitting reference to discrimination because of race, and so forth, it is this bill. I believe the gentleman who is introducing such an amendment can have no doubt as to my stand, so clearly shown in my record. I trust that he will not misunderstand when I say that it seems to me most unfortunate that this matter is brought up to us at this point. The need is not there, for both the Army and Navy use Negro nurses as part of their corps. We have reached the point where Negro nurses have proven themselves, from here out their acceptance or rejection will depend upon ability and qualification.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield. But I cannot refrain from saying that I hope the gentleman will reconsider—

Mr. POWELL. May I say to the gentleman that I know her attitude and have known it for a long time before I came to Congress.

But until the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], introduced that amendment 2 years ago, the United States Navy did not have one single Negro nurse.

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe that was because they had no Negroes at all.

Mr. POWELL. No; that is not the reason.

Mrs. BOLTON. I meant, in the officer positions. All the Navy nurses are officers. Was it not true that the moment any Negroes were allowed, of course, they took them. The Corps had been ready to use Negro nurses for a long while.

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman, because at that time there were 28 commissioned officers who were commissioned at the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, and I happened to be present at the time they were commissioned.

Mrs. BOLTON. Perhaps the gentleman's information is broader than mine, but I do know there is no question in the Army or Navy as to the need, usefulness, and happy acceptance of nurses who qualify. They must qualify as nurses just as any white nurse must qualify.

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman will yield another moment, I am sure what she says is true, but nevertheless when we passed the Selective Service Act which applied to men, we put that clause, section 4, in the act.

Mrs. BOLTON. Does it not seem to the gentleman that when a matter such as this has been clarified, it would be unfortunate to dig up some of the past and insist upon bringing it into the present and extending it into the future?

Mr. POWELL. If that would guarantee the future, I do not think it is unfortunate.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is not a question of a guaranty because this is now a matter of tradition and a matter of the rules and regulations of the organizations involved. Of course, that may not be true in other places. But I should so like to see us here in the Congress with reference to the profession of nursing recognize that we have no discriminatory methods in nursing.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true that there is no discrimination now?

Mrs. BOLTON. That is absolutely the case.

Mr. THOMASON. The present system is working well so there is no necessity for any such amendment.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. It would just help to stir the problem up. Nobody is being discriminated against under existing law and this just takes care of a voluntary situation.

Mrs. BOLTON. My point is, and I do not know that I make it clear: I think the whole problem of discrimination against minorities will be helped by not having this amendment in the bill which has to do with corps who are using Negro nurses who qualify, regardless of any possible difficulties that may have arisen in the past.

During the First World War in order to insure proper administration of the hospital wards, we saw relative rank granted. Then, in this war we had temporary commissioned status.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has expired.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Thank you, Madam Chairman. Relative rank as a present possibility was such a serious menace that we are fortunate to have a man with the understanding of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] as chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

I have no doubt of the action of this House on the bill. We have long known that if we are to have a proper nurse corps in any of our armed services we shall have to grant them the commissioned status of officers in the Army and the Navy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, of course, the committee appreciates very much the interesting work and helpfulness which the gentleman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has given to the subcommittee in working out this piece of legislation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Bell	Gallagher	McMahon
Bloom	Gerlach	Macy
Buckley	Granger	Morrison
Bulwinkle	Hardy	Murray, Tenn.
Busbey	Harness, Ind.	Nodar
Celler	Hartley	Norrell
Chapman	Hess	O'Toole
Clark	Hope	Patman
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkinson	Price, Fla.
Cox	Jenkins, Pa.	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Jennings	Simpson, Pa.
Domengeaux	Jensen	Snyder
Dorn	Kefauver	Vail
Douglas	Keogh	Whitten
Feighan	Kling	Wigglesworth
Fletcher	Larcade	Wolverton
Fuller	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 379 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include information regarding the war veterans in the Eightieth Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Monday, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of

special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT NURSE CORPS OF THE ARMY AND NAVY AND WOMEN'S SPECIALIST CORPS IN THE ARMY

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is recognized.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want the House to know that I did not make this point of no quorum.

As I said in the beginning, we appreciate very much the remarks made by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] on this bill. She has been very helpful. Also the chairman of the committee, the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

We worked out what we feel is one of the best bills following the line of unification that has been brought out of the Committee on Armed Services. We are following a procedure which may be of some interest to the House in other committees. We are taking the Army and the Navy and putting them side by side and trying to parallel the legislation we are bringing before you at the present time. Of course, we will find places along the line where it will be very difficult to put them in line as we have in this Nurse Corps bill.

As you probably know and have been told, this bill makes the Nurse Corps a permanent law. For that reason I think it is a fine piece of legislation both for the Army and the Navy. We all realize the difficulties we faced during war days when nurses were so scarce. Those of us who visited the hospitals throughout the country saw in many places the inadequate nursing facilities. The establishment of this corps is certainly a beginning in trying to render a better service to the armed forces of the Nation.

The bill has three titles. Under title I it sets up first the Nurse Corps in the Army. Then it includes the Specialist Corps. It may be of some interest to know that we have already included in this corps dietitians, physical therapists, and occupational therapists—the three groups.

There is practically no disagreement in the committee on this legislation. About the only thing we disagreed on was this: At the present time, under the retirement system in the Army, we are paying nurses 3 percent of their base salary on retirement. The Navy has the policy of 2½ percent, with which you are all familiar. Of course, I feel that the 3 percent is a fair retirement percentage. I think we have to take into consideration the age of the entry of these nurses in the Army. It was not the same when we took up this legislation. A girl can go into this corps until she is 28 years of age. Necessarily she has to retire at the age of 50 because of the fact that most of the ladies who do strenuous nursing at that age get to the point where their usefulness is not as efficient as when they were younger. So this act forces them to retire at the age of 50, except the head of the corps, who can serve up to the age of 55. In forcing them to retire at

that age, their retirement pay at 2½ percent will be very small security, and she has spent the better part of her life in the service of her country. For that reason I felt we should have written into the bill 3 percent retirement instead of 2½ percent, which the bill carries before us. However, after discussing the matter for several days we agreed to bring the bill out with 2½ percent, and I do not expect to offer an amendment to change the retirement percentage. All male officers serve to an older age and higher rank. Most of the nurses will have to retire in low rank. For this reason I felt the retirement should have been 3 percent. I do, however, want to call it to the attention of the committee. There is still a great shortage of nurses at the present time, as we all know. We are all too familiar with the fact that in the hospitals in our own home towns we are having difficulty in securing nurses.

This bill goes far enough, I believe, to offer an inducement to nurses to enter the service. It provides permanent rank and it raises the base pay, as was pointed out heretofore. We are in the position today of having to compete with the Veterans' Bureau which, of course, has a higher salary schedule. As all of us are aware, we felt that the Veterans' Administration last year should be allowed to give this inducement to secure the nurses they needed and we therefore provided a high enough salary base that we thought would be attractive.

The nurse in this corps will have some advantages. She will have security, she will have retirement. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will not amend the bill materially. I think it is a well written piece of legislation and I hope the House will pass the bill unanimously.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wish to ask about the ratio of nurses to enlisted men, 6 to 1,000. Does the gentleman feel that in peacetime that is too large or too small a number?

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Nebraska is a doctor, and my profession is more or less along that line. I feel it would depend upon the type of nursing. As the gentleman knows in some types that number would be sufficient in all probability, but in others it would not be.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In the combat zone that might not be enough, but surely during peacetime 6 to 1,000 as compared with what we have in the civilian population is way out of line.

Mr. DURHAM. I will certainly agree with the gentleman that during time of combat when there are many wounded needing treatment that would be a very small number.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] to submit a consent request.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein statements before the Committee on Agriculture.

I also ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement made by him before a committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, it seems remarkable to me that we in this country have not had a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy ere this.

Such permanent establishments exist in other countries, notably in England, Canada, and Australia.

The nursing profession is a hard and exacting one, and its standards in this country are extremely high. In order to attract the best women in the nursing profession to go into the Army and Navy their status must be permanent and they must be given permanent Army and Navy rank, as this bill proposes to do.

My distinguished colleague the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] expressed my thought admirably in her statement before the committee when she said—and I quote:

The bill will give commissioned status to certain groups that heretofore have had such status only on a temporary basis after some 20 years of service in a pseudo rank when they assumed all the responsibilities with great credit.

It is also a good thing that this bill increases the number of nurses in the Navy from 4 to 6 per 1,000 bringing them to a parity with the Army. It is to be hoped that both the Army and Navy will in time raise this parity as it still means that too much nursing has to be done by men.

Nursing is a woman's work and I am sure that most men will agree with that statement.

It proved to be so all through the war, the morale of the men was better in hospitals where they were cared for by women. This was notably so at the naval hospital at Mare Island and in Hawaii.

The able Representative from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has drawn up a bill which should and will have the support of all, regardless of party.

This is not a political question, it is simply giving to the Army and Navy nurses the rank that they have won and improving their pay a little.

It is giving their profession the dignity it must have in order to attract our best young women to enter their ranks.

This profession, the finest any woman can attain and one that a woman can do better than anything else, must be a career that women will glory in. And that Mr. Speaker, they will do more than ever when they are given permanent place in our armed forces.

The armed forces are entitled to the best nursing staff in the world. I believe that the passage of this bill will give them exactly that. For that reason I am happy to give the bill my wholehearted support and hope it passes unanimously.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time on this side.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947."

TITLE I

ARMY NURSES AND WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

SEC. 101. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this Act, there is established in the Medical Department of the Regular Army an Army Nurse Corps, which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The authorized strength of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, shall be in the ratio of 6 members thereof to every 1,000 persons of the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, but not less than a minimum authorized strength of 2,558 members. The Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, shall consist of officers in the grades of second lieutenant to lieutenant colonel, inclusive: *Provided*, That the number of lieutenant colonels on active duty shall at no time exceed seven-tenths percent, and the number of majors on active duty shall at time exceed 1½ percent, of the authorized Regular Army officer strength of such corps.

(b) From the officers permanently commissioned in such Army Nurse Corps, in permanent grade of major or above, and upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Army, the Secretary of War shall appoint the Chief of the Army Nurse Corps, who shall serve as such Chief during his pleasure for a term not to exceed 4 years and shall not be reappointed, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving.

(c) Commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. Original appointments other than appointments made under sections 203, 204, and 205 shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 28 years of age on the date of nomination by the President, who are graduates of hospital or university training schools, who are registered nurses, and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 102. (a) Effective the date of enactment of this act, there is established in the Medical Department of the Regular Army a Women's Medical Specialist Corps, which shall consist of a Dietitian Section, a Physical Therapist Section, and an Occupational Therapist Section, and which shall perform such services as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. The authorized strength of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, shall be in the ratio of nine-tenths of a member thereof to every 1,000 persons in the total authorized strength of the Regular Army, but not less than a minimum authorized strength as follows: Twenty-four officers in permanent commissioned grade of major and 385 other officers in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive. Any increase over and above the aforesaid minimum authorized strength shall be in permanent commissioned grades of captain to second lieutenant, inclusive.

(b) From the officers permanently commissioned in such Women's Medical Specialist Corps the Secretary of War shall appoint (1) the Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, who shall serve as such Chief during his pleasure, and who, without vacation of her permanent grade, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a colonel while so serving, and (2) three As-

sistant Chiefs of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, who shall be the chiefs of the sections of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, to serve as such Assistant Chiefs during his pleasure, and who, without vacation of their permanent grades, shall have the temporary rank, pay, and allowances of a lieutenant colonel while so serving.

(c) Commissioned officers of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 21 years. Original appointments other than appointments under sections 203, 204, and 205 hereof shall be made only in the grade of second lieutenant from female persons not over 28 years of age on the date of nomination by the President and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 103. (a) Prior to a date 1 year following the date of enactment of this act, each of the persons specified below shall be tendered an appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, established by this act, in a grade as prescribed in section 104 hereof.

This provision applies to each person who, on the date of enactment of this act, is serving honorably on active duty as a member, other than as Reserve nurse, of the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, regardless of whether such person is also serving under an appointment made pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), and regardless of the age of such person.

(b) Until a date 1 year following the date of enactment of this act any person who is a female citizen of the United States, who is over 21 years of age, and who meets the physical and other qualifications prescribed by the Secretary of War, may be appointed a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps, or the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, established by this act, in a grade as prescribed in section 104 hereof: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed a commissioned officer in the Army Nurse Corps under this provision except a person, otherwise qualified, who has not attained the age of 35 on the date of nomination by the President, and who, during any of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged, served honorably on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Army of the United States, pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), or as a member, including the status of Reserve nurse, of the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879): *Provided further*, That no person shall be appointed a commissioned officer in the Women's Medical Specialist Corps under this section, except a person otherwise qualified, who during any of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged served honorably on active duty as a dietitian or physical therapist with the Medical Department of the Army of the United States appointed pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324), or who served honorably as an occupational therapist with the Medical Department of the Army in the status of a civilian employee.

SEC. 104. A person appointed under the provisions of this title who is credited, as provided, in section 105 hereof, with less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, shall be appointed in the grade of second lieutenant; a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, but less than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, shall be appointed in

the grade of first lieutenant; a person credited with service equal to or greater than the minimum length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, shall be appointed in the grade of captain; majors and lieutenant colonels shall be appointed by selection, to fill vacancies in those grades from among persons who are appointed or are qualified for appointment in the grade of captain: *Provided*, That no person shall be appointed in the Army Nurse Corps or the Women's Medical Specialist Corps in a grade higher than the rank (either actual or relative) which such person held during any of the wars in which the United States is now engaged.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purposes specified in subsection (b) hereof, each person appointed pursuant to provisions of this title shall, at the time of her appointment, be credited with whichever is the greater of the following two periods of service: (1) A period of service equal to the number of years, months, and days which such person served on active Federal military service either as a member (including the status of Reserve nurse) of the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, or as a dietitian or physical therapist with the Medical Department of the Army under the provisions of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072), or in the status of a commissioned officer in the Army of the United States under appointment pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324); or (2) a period of service determined constructively in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That in computing the total period of active Federal military service each such person honorably discharged or separated from active Federal military service subsequent to May 12, 1945, shall also be credited with the period from the date of her discharge or separation from active Federal military service to the date of her appointment.

(b) The period of service credited to a person as provided in subsection (a) hereof shall be counted and construed as continuous active commissioned service on the active list of the Regular Army for the following two purposes: (1) For the purpose of determining the grade and rank of a person appointed under the provisions of this title, and (2) for the purpose of determining a person's right to promotion subsequent to appointment under the provisions of this title. Except for the foregoing specified purposes, provisions of existing law regarding length of service and benefits accruing therefrom shall not be affected.

SEC. 106. Relative rank among commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, within each corps, and between such officers and other commissioned officers of the Regular Army, shall be determined in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by law for the determination of relative rank among other commissioned officers of the Regular Army. Commissioned officers of each such corps shall not be entitled, by virtue of their rank, to command, except within their respective corps, and over such persons as may be placed under their charge by competent authority, but may be assigned by the Secretary of War to perform such duties as the interests of the service may require.

SEC. 107. (a) Commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, shall, upon completion of the length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of first lieutenant, be promoted to the permanent grade of first lieutenant; commissioned officers of such corps shall, after completing the length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of captain, be promoted to the permanent grade of captain upon satisfactorily

passing such examinations as the Secretary of War shall prescribe. Promotion to the permanent grade of major shall be by selection, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, from among officers in the grade of captain who have completed the length of service now or hereafter prescribed for promotion of promotion-list officers to the grade of major. Promotion to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel shall be by selection, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of War, from officers in the permanent grade of major with at least 1 year's service in the grade of major.

(b) The examination for promotion referred to in subsection (a) above shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War and shall be held before a board of three officers designated by the Secretary of War. Should any officer fail to pass such examination, she shall be continued on active duty for a period of 1 year after the date upon which her promotion would normally have occurred, but without being so promoted, and upon the expiration of such year, or such time anterior to the expiration thereof as may be determined by the Secretary of War to be for the best interests of the service, such officer shall undergo such reexamination as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War and which shall be held before a board of officers designated by the Secretary of War, none of whom participated in the original examination of the officer concerned. If the officer concerned fails to pass the reexamination, she shall be honorably discharged from the service in the permanent grade then held with severance pay the same as now or hereafter prescribed for officers of the Regular Army separated by reason of not being selected for promotion.

SEC. 108. (a) An officer on the active list of either the Army Nurse Corps or the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, after 20 years' active Federal service in the armed forces of the United States, may upon her request, at the discretion of the Secretary of War, be retired and shall receive retired pay equal to $2\frac{1}{2}$ percent of the base and longevity pay she would receive if serving on active duty in the grade in which retired, multiplied by a number equal to the number of years of such active Federal service: *Provided*, That in computing the number of years of such service for the purpose of determining the percentage of active-duty pay, and for no other purpose, any fractional part of a year amounting to 6 months or more shall be counted as a complete year: *Provided further*, That in no event shall such retired pay exceed 75 percent of such base and longevity pay: *And provided further*, That regardless of the years of service completed, at any time after such an officer shall have attained the age of 50, if her permanent grade is below that of major, or at any time after such an officer shall have attained the age of 55, if her permanent grade is major or higher, she may, at the discretion of the Secretary of War without her consent, be retired and upon such retirement she shall receive retired pay equal to 3 percent of the base and longevity pay she would receive if serving on active duty in the grade in which retired, multiplied by a number equal to the number of years of her active Federal service, but in no event shall such retired pay exceed 75 percent of such base and longevity pay.

(b) Unless entitled to higher retired rank or pay under any provision of law, each commissioned officer who shall have served for 4 years as Chief of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, or as Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, or as an Assistant Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, Regular Army, shall upon retirement be retired with the rank held by her while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and

longevity pay which she would receive if serving on active duty with such rank, and if thereafter recalled to active service, shall be recalled in such rank and shall constitute an additional number therein: *Provided*, That the commissioned officer first appointed as Chief of the Army Nurse Corps and the commissioned officer first appointed as Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps, pursuant to this act, shall, without limitation as to the time they shall serve in such capacities, upon retirement be retired with the rank held while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law, computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay they would receive if serving on active duty with such rank.

(c) In determining eligibility for retirement and the percentage of active-service pay to be employed in computing the amount of retired pay under any provision of law, each commissioned officer on the active list of the Regular Army who is commissioned in any of the corps established by this act, shall be deemed to have at least the same length of continuous active commissioned service in the Regular Army as any officer junior to her rank in the Medical Department of the Regular Army.

SEC. 109. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers of the Regular Army, to former male commissioned officers of the Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall in like cases be applicable respectively to commissioned officers of any of the corps established by this act, Regular Army, to former commissioned officers of any of the corps established by this act, Regular Army, and to their dependents and beneficiaries.

SEC. 110. Except for the purpose of determining a person's grade, rank, and right to promotion in the Regular Army (see section 105 (b) hereof) in computing years of active Federal military service for all purposes of any person, there shall be credited active military service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active military service rendered pursuant to an appointment under the provisions of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1072), and active military service rendered pursuant to an appointment under the act of June 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 324).

SEC. 111. The Secretary of War, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer commissioned in any of the corps established by this title.

SEC. 112. Personnel appointed in the Regular Army under the provisions of this act shall be in addition to the numbers of other commissioned officers of the Regular Army now or hereafter prescribed by law.

SEC. 113. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this act, no further appointment shall be made in the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, and no further appointment shall be made pursuant to the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1073), or pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 324). The acceptance of any Regular Army appointment under this act shall operate to vacate any other military or civilian status in or with the Military Establishment theretofore occupied by the appointee except an appointment pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944.

(b) Effective 6 months following the date of enactment of this act, the Army Nurse Corps created by chapter V of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 879), as amended, and all offices and appointments therein shall cease to exist: *Provided*, That this provision shall not affect the rights, benefits, privileges, pay, allowances, gratuities, or leave accrued to a person, her dependents, or beneficiaries by virtue of any laws or regulations in effect prior to the enactment of this act,

and where necessary to the full enjoyment of terminal leave, terminal-leave pay, retirement and retired pay, pensions, travel allowance, transportation of dependents and effects, and rights, benefits, privileges, and gratuities to which such person or her dependents have become entitled, such corps, offices, and appointments shall continue to exist but only for such purposes.

SEC. 114. Effective the date of enactment of this act, there shall be established in the Officers' Reserve Corps of the Army of the United States an Army Nurse Corps Section and a Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section.

SEC. 115. Except as otherwise specifically provided, all laws and regulations now or hereafter applicable to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries, shall, in like cases, be applicable, respectively, to commissioned officers and former commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps Section and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section of the Officers' Reserve Corps, and to their dependents and beneficiaries.

SEC. 116. Appointments in the Army Nurse Corps Section and the Women's Medical Specialist Corps Section of the Officers' Reserve Corps may be made in such grades and under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, from female citizens of the United States, who have attained the age of 21 years, and who possess such physical and other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That female officers appointed pursuant to the act of June 22, 1944, and honorably separated from the service thereafter may, if otherwise qualified, be appointed in the appropriate section of the Officers' Reserve Corps established hereby in the highest grade satisfactorily held by her in active service.

SEC. 117. In addition to the obligation to render active service now or hereafter provided with respect to other members of the Officers' Reserve Corps a member of those sections established in the Officers' Reserve Corps by this title may, with her consent, be called to active duty by the Secretary of War for any period or periods of time according to the needs of the Military Establishment, as determined by the Secretary of War.

TITLE II

NAVY NURSE CORPS

SEC. 201. The Nurse Corps of the United States Navy shall consist of officers commissioned in the grade of nurse by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such officers shall have the rank of commander, lieutenant commander, lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), or ensign. The total authorized number of officers of the Nurse Corps shall be six for each thousand of the authorized number of officers, midshipmen, and enlisted personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps.

SEC. 202. There shall be a Director of the Nurse Corps appointed by the Secretary of the Navy, upon the recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Navy, from among the officers of the active list of the Nurse Corps for a term of not more than 4 years, to serve at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Navy. While so serving the Director shall have the rank of captain, shall be entitled to the pay and allowances as are now or may be hereafter prescribed by law for a captain of the Navy, and her regular status as a commissioned officer of the Nurse Corps shall not be disturbed by reason of such appointment.

SEC. 203. All members of the active list of the existing Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy, who, on the effective date of this act, are serving in a temporary rank authorized by present law, may, during a period of not more than 6 months after enactment of this act, be transferred to the Nurse Corps created by this act, and, upon transfer, shall be appointed

for temporary service pursuant to, and subject to the limitations of, the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as now or hereafter amended, to the same rank and with the same precedence held by them on the date of such transfer, and for the purposes of such appointments under the said act, such members of the Nurse Corps shall be considered to be commissioned officers in the Regular Navy. Nurses so transferred, who at the time of such transfer had to their credit leave accrued but not taken, shall not, by reason of such transfer, lose such accrued leave. Prior to the termination of their temporary appointments, the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint a board of not less than three naval officers, who, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, shall assign running mates to the Nurse Corps officers transferred and appointed for temporary service pursuant to this section, and such officers shall be assigned permanent ranks corresponding to the permanent ranks held by their running mates: *Provided*, That no officer of the Nurse Corps shall be assigned a permanent rank above that of commander.

SEC. 204. Except as provided in sections 203 and 211 of this title, appointments to the grade of nurse in the Regular Navy shall be with the rank of ensign, and each such appointment shall be subject to revocation by the Secretary of the Navy until such time as the appointee is advanced to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade). Officers whose appointments are so revoked shall be discharged from the service without advanced pay. Such appointees shall be female citizens of the United States who shall have reached the age of 21 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed, and who shall not have reached the age of 28 years on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed. No person shall be appointed pursuant to this section until she shall have established her mental, moral, educational, professional, and physical qualifications to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy.

SEC. 205. Officers of the Navy Nurse Corps shall have authority in medical and sanitary matters and all other work within the line of their professional duties in and about naval hospitals and other activities of the Medical Department of the Navy next after officers of the Medical Corps and the Dental Corps of the Navy. They shall exercise such military authority as may be prescribed from time to time by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That they shall not be eligible for the exercise of command.

SEC. 206. (a) All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the advancement in rank of officers of the staff corps of the Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in the following subsections of this section, shall be construed to include officers of the Nurse Corps.

(b) Paragraph 2, section 16, of the act of June 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 723); section 17 of the act of June 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 724); and section 4 of the act of August 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 530), shall not apply to officers of the Nurse Corps established by this title.

(c) Section 3 of the act of June 10, 1926, is hereby amended by inserting the following proviso after the colon which appears after the word "mate" in line 17, paragraph 4, thereof, on page 718, volume 44, Statutes at Large: "*Provided further*, That an officer of the Nurse Corps recommended for advancement to the rank of commander in the approved report of a selection board shall be eligible for advancement to such rank when a vacancy occurs therein, and when so advanced such officer shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the rank of commander only from the date of the vacancy."

(d) Section 16 of the act of June 10, 1926, is hereby amended by striking out the period as it appears after the word "him" in line 7, paragraph 1, thereof, on page 723, volume

44, Statutes at Large, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following proviso: "*Provided*, That a selection board to recommend officers of the Nurse Corps for advancement to the rank of commander shall be convened only if there exists a vacancy in such rank or if the Secretary of the Navy estimates or determines that a vacancy will occur in the ensuing 12-month period."

(e) Boards for selection of Nurse Corps officers for recommendation for advancement to the ranks of commander, lieutenant commander, and lieutenant shall be composed of not less than six nor more than nine officers not below the rank of captain on the active or retired list of the Medical Corps: *Provided*, That in case there is not a sufficient number of officers of the Medical Corps legally or physically qualified to serve on the selection board as herein provided, officers of the line of the active list of the rank of captain may be detailed to duty on such board to constitute the required membership.

SEC. 207. (a) All provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to retired officers of the staff corps of the Navy and to the retirement or separation from the active list of such officers, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in the following subsections of this section, shall be construed to include officers of the Nurse Corps.

(b) Each officer of the Navy Nurse Corps who attains the age of 55 years while serving in the rank of commander or lieutenant commander and each officer of such corps who attains the age of 50 years while serving in the rank of lieutenant or below, shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following that in which she attains such age, and, except as otherwise provided in this section, shall be placed on the retired list in the permanent rank held by her at the time of retirement. Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the transfer, under section 203 hereof, to the Nurse Corps created by this act of such member of the Nurse Corps, which exceeded prior to the enactment of this act, as may have reached the retirement ages specified herein prior to such transfer.

(c) An officer of the Navy Nurse Corps, who may be retired for any reason while serving as Director of such corps or subsequent to service as Director while serving in a lower rank, may, in the discretion of the President if she shall have served 2½ years or more as Director, be placed on the retired list in the rank held by her as Director.

(d) An officer of the Navy Nurse Corps who shall have served prior to July 1, 1946, in a rank higher than her permanent rank, other than by virtue of appointment as Director of the said corps, shall, when retired for any reason if not otherwise entitled to the same or higher rank, be advanced to the highest rank in which, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, she served satisfactorily. In any case where, as determined by the Secretary of the Navy, any such officer has not performed satisfactory duty in the highest rank held by her while on active duty, she shall be placed on the retired list with the next lower rank in which she has served but not lower than her permanent rank.

(e) An officer of the Nurse Corps placed on the retired list in her permanent rank pursuant to subsection (b) of this section shall receive retired pay at the rate of 2½ percent of the active-duty pay to which entitled at the time of retirement, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active-duty pay, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay.

(f) An officer of the Nurse Corps retired by reason of physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 75

percent of active-duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list.

(g) An officer of the Nurse Corps retired other than by reason of physical disability incurred in the line of duty shall, if placed on the retired list in a rank higher than her permanent rank, receive retired pay equal to 2½ percent of the active-duty pay to which she would be entitled if serving, at the time of retirement, on active duty in the rank in which placed upon the retired list, multiplied by the number of years for which entitled to credit in the computation of her active-duty pay, not to exceed a total of 75 percent of said active-duty pay.

(h) In any instance in which retired pay is computed as prescribed in subsections (e) and (g) of this section, a fractional year of 6 months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years by which the rate of 2½ percent is multiplied.

(i) The number of years service to be credited to officers of the Navy Nurse Corps in determining their eligibility for voluntary retirement shall be based on the total of all active service, either under an appointment or contract or as a commissioned officer in the Nurse Corps of the Army or Navy, or the reserve components thereof and all active service in the Nurse Corps or the Nurse Corps Reserve abolished by this act shall, for this purpose only, be regarded as commissioned service in the Navy or the reserve components thereof, as the case may be.

(j) Retired officers of the Navy Nurse Corps shall be authorized to bear the title, and, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy, to wear the uniform of the rank with which retired.

SEC. 208. (a) All provisions of law relating to pay, leave, money allowances for subsistence, and rental of quarters, mileage and other travel allowances, or other allowances, benefits, or emoluments, of male officers of the Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in subsection (b) of this section, are hereby made applicable to officers of the Nurse Corps: *Provided*, That the husbands of officers of the Navy Nurse Corps shall not be considered dependents of such officers unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support: *Provided further*, That officers of the Nurse Corps may be subsisted in hospital messes in accordance with section 17 (a) of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 604, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), and such officers may be assigned quarters in naval hospitals under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

(b) Longevity pay for officers of the Navy Nurse Corps shall be based upon the total of all periods of active service during which they have held or shall hold appointments as nurses or as commissioned officers in the Nurse Corps of the Army, Navy, or Public Health Service, or the reserve components thereof.

SEC. 209. The Secretary of Navy, under the circumstances and in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer commissioned in any of the corps established by this title.

SEC. 210. The Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1175), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding after section 508 thereof an additional title as follows:

"TITLE VI—NURSE CORPS RESERVE"

"SEC. 601. A Nurse Corps Reserve is hereby established which shall be a branch of the Naval Reserve and shall be administered under the same provisions in all respects (except as may be necessary to adapt said provisions to the Nurse Corps Reserve, or as specifically provided herein) as those contained

in this act or which may hereafter be enacted with respect to the Volunteer Reserve.

"Sec. 602. Members of the Nurse Corps Reserve may be commissioned in appropriate ranks corresponding to those of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe. Such members of the Nurse Corps Reserve, when on active duty, shall have the same authority in and about naval hospitals and other activities of the Medical Department of the Navy as officers of the Nurse Corps of the Regular Navy.

"Sec. 603. The Reserve established by this title shall be composed of members who are female citizens of the United States and who shall have such professional or other qualifications as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy.

"Sec. 604. All nurses of the Volunteer Reserve appointed under the authority of title 1, section 4, of this act are hereby transferred to the Nurse Corps Reserve established by section 601 of this title in such permanent ranks as the Secretary of the Navy may determine and the temporary ranks held by those on active duty on the effective date of this title shall not be vacated by reason of such transfer. Each nurse so transferred, who at the time of such transfer had to her credit leave accrued but not taken, may subsequent to such transfer, be granted such leave without loss of pay and allowances."

Sec. 211. Sections 5, 6, and 7 of the act of April 18, 1946 (60 Stat. 92), as now or hereafter amended, shall be construed to include members of the Nurse Corps Reserve and former members of the Nurse Corps or the Nurse Corps Reserve abolished by this act: *Provided*, That no member of the Nurse Corps Reserve or former member of the Nurse Corps or the Nurse Corps Reserve shall be commissioned in the Nurse Corps of the United States Navy created and established by this act who has reached the age of 35 years.

Sec. 212. Nurses appointed to commissioned rank pursuant to section 203 of this title who, under a prior appointment in the Nurse Corps, shall have subscribed to the oath of office as required by section 1757, Revised Statutes, shall not be required to renew such oath or take a new oath under her appointment as a commissioned officer in the Nurse Corps of the United States Navy if her service in the Nurse Corps after taking such oath shall have been continuous.

Sec. 213. Effective 6 months after enactment of this title, all laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this title are hereby repealed, and the provisions of this title shall be in effect in lieu thereof and such repeal shall include but shall not be limited to the following acts and parts of acts: *Provided*, That the total number of officers in the permanent rank of commander and lieutenant commander shall not exceed seven-tenths percent and one and six-tenths percent, respectively, of the total number of officers permanently commissioned in the Navy Nurse Corps and serving on active duty.

(a) The third paragraph, subheading "Repairs, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," heading "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery," of the act of May 13, 1908, as it appears on page 146, volume 35, Statutes at Large.

(b) So much of the act of May 13, 1926 (44 Stat. 531), as relates to the Navy Nurse Corps.

(c) So much of the act of June 20, 1930 (46 Stat. 790), as amended by the acts of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1502), and October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1192), as relates to the Navy Nurse Corps.

(d) That part of section 4 of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1176), which relates to the appointment of female registered nurses in the Volunteer Reserve.

(e) That part of section 2 of the act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 360), which author-

izes an increase of 20 percent in base pay of Navy nurses while on sea duty.

(f) So much of section 13 of the act of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 366), as relates to the Navy Nurse Corps.

(g) The act of July 3, 1942 (56 Stat. 646).

(h) Section 7 of the act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1074).

(i) The act of February 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 105).

(j) The act of December 3, 1945 (59 Stat. 594).

Sec. 214. All provisions of existing law repealed by section 213 of this title, which relate to the retirement and the retired pay of members or officers of the Navy Nurse Corps, shall remain in effect with respect to such members or officers who have been retired prior to the effective date of section 213 of this title, and no retired member or officer of the Navy Nurse Corps shall suffer by reason of this title any reduction or loss of retirement benefits to which she was entitled upon the effective date of this act.

Sec. 215. Except as provided in section 213 hereof, this act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. VINSON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in full in the Record.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to speak on the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, if my request is granted, it does not preclude anyone from offering an amendment anywhere in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Not if the gentleman includes that in his request.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, my request is in the interest of saving time and the reading of a bill containing some 18 or 20 pages over which there is no controversy.

The SPEAKER. The Members would not be precluded from offering amendments if the gentleman will include that in the request.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I include that as a part of the request and also that the bill may be open for amendment at any point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: Page 3, line 3, strike out "203", "204", and "205" and insert "103", "104", and "105."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all committee amendments, which are clarifying amendments, may be presented and voted on en bloc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 5, substitute the words "twenty-eight" for the words "twenty-six."

On page 4, line 22, substitute the figures "103, 104, and 105" for the figures "203, 204, and 205," respectively.

On page 5, line 24, substitute the word "a" for the word "no."

On page 5, line 25, delete the words "shall be."

On page 6, delete all of lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and substitute therefor, the following words and phrases: "Corps under this provision shall not have attained the age of 35 on the date of nomination by the President, shall be otherwise qualified, and, during any of the wars in which the United States is presently engaged, shall have served honorably on active duty as a commissioned officer of the Army of the United States, pursuant to the act of June 22."

On page 12, line 4, substitute the figure "2½" for the figure "3."

On page 17, line 6, delete section 201 and substitute therefor, the following new section 201:

"A Nurse Corps, which shall be a component part of the Medical Department of the Navy, is hereby created and established as a Staff Corps of the United States Navy. The Navy Nurse Corps shall consist of officers commissioned in the grade of nurse by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and such officers shall have the rank of commander, lieutenant commander, lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), or ensign: *Provided*, That the total number of officers in the permanent rank of commander and lieutenant commander shall not exceed seven-tenths percent and 1½ percent respectively, of the total number of officers permanently commissioned in the Navy Nurse Corps and serving on active duty. The total authorized number of officers of the Nurse Corps shall be 6 for each 1,000 of the authorized number of officers, midshipmen, and enlisted personnel of the active list of the Regular Navy and Regular Marine Corps."

On page 17, line 19, following the word "corps" insert the following words: "of the permanent grade or rank of lieutenant commander or above."

On page 19, line 16, substitute the words "twenty-nine" for the words "twenty-eight."

On page 20, line 5, delete all of section 206 (a) and substitute therefor the following new section:

"Sec. 206. (a) Subject to the limitations of section 201 of this title, all provisions of law now existing or hereafter enacted relating to the advancement in rank of officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy, except those provisions relating to the same subject matter provided for in the following subsections of this section, shall be construed to include officers of the Nurse Corps."

On page 22, line 18, add the letter "s" to the word "member."

On page 22, line 19, substitute the word "existed" for the word "exceeded."

On page 23, line 2, following the word "Director" substitute a colon for the period and add the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the commissioned officer first appointed as Director of the Navy Nurse Corps, pursuant to this act, shall without limitation as to the time she shall serve in such capacity, upon retirement be retired with the rank held while so serving, and shall receive retired pay at the rate prescribed by law computed on the basis of the base and longevity pay she would have received if serving on active duty with such rank."

On page 23, line 17, substitute the figure "2½" for the figure "3."

On page 26, line 13, delete the words "any of the corps" and substitute therefor the words "the Nurse Corps."

On page 28, line 6, following the word "Reserve" insert the following words: "who has reached the age of 35 years."

On page 28, line 23, insert a period after the word "acts" and delete the entire proviso on lines 23, 24, 25, and lines 1, 2, and 3 on page 29.

On page 30, line 12, substitute the word "title" for the word "act" and delete the words "30 days after," substituting therefor the word "upon."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question but what the women of the country have demonstrated their ability to perform nursing services and other activities in connection with the Army and the Navy. I do want to point out to my colleagues, however, something that I have called to your attention before on several occasions, and that is the ratio, not only of nurses but doctors, to military personnel.

This bill calls for 6 nurses for each 1,000 enlisted personnel in the Army and the Navy. The medical men have about the same ratio. Well, now, in areas of combat zones that may not be enough. The war is now over. The military personnel in our Army and Navy consists of healthy young men. The idea of having 6 nurses to every 1,000 men in the military is out of joint. It is not necessary to have 6 physicians or nurses for every 1,000 enlisted men. The ratio of physicians to civilian population in this country is about 1 physician to every 1,500 people. On that ratio the Army and the Navy would have about 9 physicians for every 1,500; in other words, we have in our civilian population men, women, and children, and old folks, who need the services of the nurses and the doctors just as much as our military needs them. I realize that this bill calls for a minimum strength of not less than 2,558. We should have a permanent Nurse Corps. I think it is a good thing, and we need it in the Army and the Navy, but I am fearful that the military authorities will then proceed to set up 6 nurses to every 1,000 enlisted men. This ratio for nurses and doctors is far too high in peacetime.

I hear from many medical men in the army of occupation. They tell me that they have about seven physicians to every 100 enlisted men.

These medical men sit around doing very little. The enlisted men are healthy and there is no need for so many doctors for so few men. In your community and mine there are old people, women and children, who need the attention of physicians. The need for nurses and doctors is acute in the country; why should the military have so many? I think the Nurses' Corps is essential, but I say to you as I have told the military committees before, that having 6 doctors and 6 nurses to every 1,000 enlisted personnel in the Army and the Navy is out of joint and you ought to do something about the problem. There ought to be a revision of those things, because if they go ahead now and take 6 nurses for every 1,000 enlisted men they are going to strip your community and my community of needed nursing personnel that are so sorely needed at this time. I hope the military authorities will see fit to get along, perhaps, with two to the thousand.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that we have a very heavy load in both Army and Navy hospitals today, approximately 70,000 sick soldiers and sailors?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I understand that. I understand they are not all being taken care of by Army nurses either. They are taken care of by civilian nursing personnel. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The bill provides for only 6 per thousand of enlisted personnel and officer strength of both the Army and the Navy, but the testimony before the Committee on Armed Services was that we have nearly 1,000,000 dependents of Navy enlisted and officer personnel to take care of in hospitals of the country, a million outside the enlisted personnel.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Of course, if the Army and Navy are going to start in on a program of taking care of all the civilian personnel of the country, then we are going to need more nurses. I do not understand that the function of this bill is that they are going to take care of civilian personnel. It says in the bill that they shall have 6 members thereof to every 1,000 persons of the authorized strength of the Regular Army. That is military personnel.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the present law the Navy and Army must take care of certain dependents of our military and naval personnel.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it in the bill?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It is part of the general law, and this bill provides only the ratio of nurses to enlisted strength.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I still say 6 to 1,000 is too many for the enlisted personnel. Even with 1,000,000 dependents it means a ratio of 3 to every 1,000, and that is 200 percent more than we have for civilians.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 2, line 25, after "United States", insert the following: "irrespective of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, let me read page 2, subsection (c), as it is sought to be amended:

Commissioned officers of the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from female citizens of the United States irrespective of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, who have achieved the age of 21 years.

I think that is a reasonable amendment. As I said a few moments ago, it

is one we all agreed on 2 years ago. On March 6 it was proposed by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I note in the RECORD that my colleague and friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] said, "I commend the gentleman for his excellent statement." As I look through the RECORD before me I note that the motion went through unanimously 2 years ago. That means all of us voted for it. There was not a yea and nay vote on it. It was a voice vote. When the bill came to final passage, everyone except 42 voted in favor of the bill with that clause in it. I see that our minority leader of this committee [Mr. RIVERS] was not present that day, so we can excuse him, but others were here and I am looking at you face to face, and you voted for it.

Now, what is the objection? I am sure there is no objection by the Republicans, because this motion is identical to the one presented by your distinguished Member [Mr. BROWN of Ohio], and you all voted for it 2 years ago. The Republicans were a minority then; you are a majority now. If this amendment is defeated, it will be because of the Republican Party; you control the majority of the votes.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHAFER. What is the purpose of the amendment? Is there discrimination now in the service?

Mr. POWELL. Yes; there is.

Mr. SHAFER. In what instance?

Mr. POWELL. If the gentleman will permit me to finish my preliminary statement, I will have covered that matter, and then I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman again for a question.

Mr. Speaker, at that time, 2 years ago, we had about 100,000 Negro men serving in the United States Navy without a single Negro nurse in charge—not a Negro nurse was in the Navy. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] brought that out. I have the facts with me. In other words, we had Negro men being waited on and taken care of when they were wounded or ill by white nurses. We needed Negro nurses then. We need them now. We do not know if we may need them next month or next year. We do not know when another world war will be upon us. This is a perfectly logical and perfectly reasonable proposition and it is something that has already been passed on.

When Mr. BROWN's amendment was passed, the very next week the United States Navy brought in a token—a handful, and when I say a handful, I really mean a handful—less than 10 Negro nurses. Of course, they are in the service now, it is true. But what guarantee have we that this policy will obtain in years to come unless we write it into the law?

I know there is a group of my colleagues here who have certain peculiar responsibilities. I recognize these responsibilities. I am talking to you gentlemen now, as I have talked to you off the floor and have talked to you face to face. We have come to know each other rather well.

This is the same thing you passed in the Selective Service Act. It is the same thing that obtains in your home towns right now. There is not a hospital in your home town, wherever you may come from, where you do not have Negro nurses in the Negro wards. But I know your towns. I have been there. I have talked to you today and in days gone by about this. It is a perfectly logical, American, sane approach. It is guaranteeing a policy for the future to make sure that when the next crisis comes we will be able to use, in the language of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] "9,000 accredited graduate Negro nurses." That is his own language as he spoke on March 6, 1945.

We do not know when another war will be upon us. It may be sooner than we think and not as far away as we hope. We want to be ready. We want to have every American citizen who is qualified to do his best.

Again I repeat, if this amendment is defeated it will be the fault of the Republicans.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: At the end of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] strike out the period and add "membership or nonmembership in any labor organization."

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment to the amendment is not germane. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York merely deals with the question of race, creed, or color, and national origin. The amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan deals with an entirely different subject and therefore is not germane to the subject dealt with in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan deals with the question of membership in labor unions.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] provides generally that appointment in the Nurse Corps shall be made irrespective of race, creed, color, or national origin.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] simply adds an additional category.

In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment is germane, and the Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, with the right to the gentleman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] to close the debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no one is responsible because he has a certain color or lack of color, because he comes from a certain race of people. Folks are responsible for adhering to a certain creed. So it seems as though, if the purpose of the amendment is to prevent discrimination, it should include in its terms membership or nonmembership in a labor organization, and provide that no nurse should be deprived of a job because she belonged or did not belong to a labor organization.

If it be said that an amendment of this kind has no place in the bill which has to do with the personnel of the Army and the Navy, it need only be remembered that all through the last war the Navy discriminated against men and women who did not belong to a labor organization. I can show you the records where the Navy ordered the discharge of men who were engaged in making munitions of war because they had not paid their union dues. They might have had sons or daughters in the armed services; they might have wanted to work in the factory to supply those sons and daughters with the weapons with which to fight, but the Navy of the United States discriminated against them because they did not belong to a union and said they must be discharged; and when they were discharged the Navy said they could not work until they paid up. Now, what kind of a situation is that? Do you approve of it?

In the third area, the Army Commander of the district told his truck drivers who were carrying supplies to soldiers not to go through the picket line until they had obtained the consent of the union boss. Our soldiers, our sailors, our men and our women were fighting and winning over the enemy abroad, on the battlefields all over the country, but here at home the Army and Navy backed up and took orders from the union boss.

In Detroit, away back in 1939, for 42 days the Navy let a picket line hold possession of finished materials, and of the Navy's own patterns which they needed in the Philadelphia Navy Yard rather than cross a picket-line. Is there any reason why, if we are to prevent discrimination, we should not go the whole way; we should not also prevent discrimination because some American man or woman does not choose to cross the hand of some collector of tribute working in behalf of an organization outside of the Government which demands that they must pay in order to work in defense of the country? Let us outlaw the closed shop.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This amendment as originally offered is in the exact language of the first plank in the Communist platform, as published the other day in a local paper. Now, suppose we are approaching war, which may be a possibility, shall we say you cannot question the national origin of an applicant?

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the President's message of yesterday it was suggested that we stop communism at the frontiers of Turkey and Greece. I say stop it here in America. I recall the day—it is popular now to talk against communism—I recall the day when Martin Dies stood in the well of this House fighting communism, yet these papers in the cities abused and misused him. I recall the day when Mrs. Roosevelt—bless your dear hearts—walked over to the big caucus room with her Communist friends in an effort to aid them as they were about to testify before a committee charged with exposing Communists.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members ought to be here to listen to what the gentleman from Maine has to say. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Maine is recognized.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, long hearings were held on this bill, H. R. 1943, and much testimony was given, none, however, on this subject of Negro nurses. No amendment was offered in committee on this subject.

There is not any objection, as I see it, to the intent of the amendment, but in my opinion it would serve no purpose. It is not necessary.

Approximately 600 Negro nurses served with distinction during the war. Only this week military officials told me of the excellent service given by these Negro nurses and that they are taking all who apply and can qualify. Inquiries from Hampton Institute, Virginia as to opportunities for graduate nurses have been made and the Navy has replied that all Negro nurses who can qualify physically and professionally will be given the same consideration as all other applicants. From this it is reported there will be a group of recent graduates from this Institute indoctrinated soon at Bethesda. Of course, there are many nurses who do not meet the physical requirements regardless of color. I do not want discrimination. My record is clear on this. I feel that these two amendments that have been offered are not needed. In reference to the last one offered, the Labor Committee has jurisdiction of that matter and is considering amendments to labor laws. So far as the first one is concerned, Negro nurses are already in the service and will continue to be so long as they are qualified, therefore such an amendment as has been offered is un-

necessary. Those nurses are being promoted as are all nurses.

Mr. Speaker, there must be nurses and there must be nursing whether there is an emergency or not. The Army and Navy testified that without this legislation they cannot care for the boys who are in the service and who are ill now. This legislation does not cost any more than we are paying or have been paying since 1944.

There is nothing new in this bill, H. R. 1943. It simply continues what we already have. It places the nurses on a permanent status rather than on a temporary basis. Nurses are serving under temporary legislation. There is no assurance as to length of service or retirement privileges, so the nurses are looking around for something better. Without this legislation we are facing complete dissolution of the temporary Nurse Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this bill without additional amendments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to ask the gentleman what guaranties she has that what is beginning now without law will take place 10, 15, or 20 years from now? This did not begin in the service until 2 years ago when we passed an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. Twenty-six years ago our Navy had Negro commissioned officers, then changed its policy. When World War II came on we were caught and did not have them. During the war period we had to train them all over again, change the policy back again. My amendment would merely guarantee this policy.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. As the gentleman knows, I have worked with the Navy and Army a long time. I have confidence that the military officials will continue the excellent service that has been rendered by the nurses.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks data from the Army and the Navy.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SURGEON GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1947.

Memorandum for Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH.

Subject: Utilization of Negro nurses in the Army during World War II.

According to the records of this office the first Negro nurses were appointed in April 1941, when 12 were assigned as second lieutenants, and from that time forward, with the exception of a few months, Negro nurses were given appointments throughout the procurement period until approximately 600 Negro nurses had been appointed in the corps, the peak strength at one time being 537 nurses.

In addition to being assigned as individuals to stations in the United States, three all-Negro units were organized and sent overseas for duty, one to Liberia, one to England, and one to the South Pacific.

In the early part of the war a policy was adopted to utilize the Negro nurses in the care of Negro patients, and they were more or less segregated as far as quarters and messing was concerned. Later, however, they were assigned indiscriminately and worked along with white nurses in the care of both white and Negro patients and have

participated in the same messes and occupied quarters along with white nurses. They have been promoted according to War Department policy along with all other members of the corps.

The Negro units assigned to oversea service received for treatment white patients as well as Negro. For a time these Negro units were commanded by white officers and the nursing service was directed by white nurses. After a period of training in Army Administration the units were placed under the command of a Negro medical officer with a Negro chief nurse as director of nursing service.

There are at present 90 Negro nurses in the Army on active duty. They are in grades from second lieutenant to captain.

It is believed that the majority of nurses who were separated have been separated at their own request except during a period when demobilization directives from the War Department made it imperative to release nurses.

In other words, it is believed that every effort has been made to afford Negro nurses an opportunity to advance in the corps along with white nurses. We are pleased to report that on the whole they have rendered a very excellent service and have adapted very satisfactorily to the military situation.

NORMAN T. KIRK,
Major General,
The Surgeon General.

The Navy Department reports that all together only 16 Negro nurses applied for service during the war. Six of these qualified and were offered appointments. Four of the six accepted the appointments, one changed her mind and declined, and the other failed on final physical examination. Two of the four married while in the service. According to regulations, except during the war, married nurses are not retained. One separated by reason of points in August 1946, and the remaining one was given extension to June 1948, and it is expected she will be given permanent status if she desires it when this bill becomes law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. POWELL) there were—ayes 47, noes 187.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Speaker, I offer two perfecting amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

On page 6, line 15, strike out "is presently" and insert "was."

Page 7, line 19, strike out "is now" and insert "was."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 5 minutes, but I did want this time just

to ask the gentlewoman from Maine a question. I have not had time to read all the hearings. For the Record I would like to inquire of the gentlewoman from Maine whether any consideration was given to recognizing medical and psychiatric social workers in this proposed medical specialist staff, which, according to the bill, includes physical therapist and occupational therapist sections.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Nothing was heard on that subject. Physical therapists and occupational therapists were the only ones included at the moment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is my understanding—and if I am wrong, I hope the gentlewoman will correct me—that the requirements for medical and psychiatric social workers, both of which are employed by the Army and the Navy and the Veterans' Administration, are fully as high as the groups recognized in this bill, in that they require a post-graduate course in order to be recognized as medical and psychiatric social workers, and I was wondering whether there was any reason other than that the associations have not asked for them that they were left out.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. The subject was not discussed in any of the hearings, so there was no evidence presented.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Then the responsibility lies with their own organizations, is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that subject at the present time is being taken care of by civilian personnel. There are a very small number involved, and there is very little need of them in the corps because of such a small number.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand that this is being given consideration by the various groups that the gentleman speaks of. I know it is true, insofar as those groups are concerned, in relation to their being taken into the Veterans' Administration medical service. I think you will probably find that that is true with the Army and Navy also.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am very sure the bill will pass. There is a tremendous interest in it. The work of the nurses is beyond praise, and this affords permanent appreciation of it. As the Army and the Navy have both asked for this, I think there can be no doubt about its unanimous passage.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] that this is a very meritorious bill and will undoubtedly have the support of an overwhelming majority of the House. In my opinion, however, it would have been a much better bill if the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] had been adopted. It may be true that at the present time the Navy is not discriminating against colored nurses, but the day may come when, due to an over-supply of nurses or some admiral with certain prejudices, discrimination may again be indulged in. I imagine all of us are influenced at times by certain of our own experiences. For the past 20

years I have employed a colored laundress. I have seen her two baby girls grow up. Today one of them is attending college here in the District of Columbia, while the older sister is taking postgraduate work at Yale University, having completed her nurse's training course. These two girls have worked their way through college with what little assistance their mother could provide by working as a laundress day by day. The Navy could certainly use to good advantage the services of this very capable and intelligent colored nurse. If we ever find that the Navy is discriminating on the basis of race, creed, or color, I hope the Congress will speedily amend this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 139 was laid on the table.

DOMESTIC RUBBER PRODUCTION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 144, Rept. No. 144), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 118) to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

RENEWAL OF EXPIRING FIVE-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM POLICIES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period. That after general debate, which shall

be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this resolution would make in order the immediate consideration of H. R. 1327, a bill to amend existing law to allow veterans to renew their 5-year level-premium term insurance policies for another 5-year period. Five-year level-term insurance for veterans was first authorized by Congress in 1926. Since then there have been three laws renewing the privilege for periods of 5 years each. A veteran can carry term insurance for a total of 20 years under existing law. Passage of this bill would permit veterans to carry their term insurance for a total of 25 years. Twelve thousand eight hundred and twenty-one veterans have renewed their term insurance policies each time the law was extended. Six thousand one hundred and sixty-one have renewed it 3 times; 7,213, twice; and 10,998 obtained their term insurance under the law passed about 5 years ago. In all, there are 37,195 veterans holding this type of Government insurance policy. This bill extends for another 5 years the privilege of renewing their policy.

H. R. 1327 was reported unanimously by the Committee on Veterans Affairs, and the resolution making its immediate consideration in order was unanimously reported by the Rules Committee. One hour of general debate was considered sufficient on the bill, as it is a non-partisan measure, and since little or no opposition is likely to arise. The bill may be amended on the floor under the 5-minute rule. One motion to recommit is also provided by House Resolution 138 should any opposition to the bill arise.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received from a constituent and which letter, I believe, evidences an outstanding example of the practice of the Golden Rule and the Christian ethic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

FIVE-YEAR LEVEL-PREMIUM TERM POLICIES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of

renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1327, with Mr. RIZLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I was out of the Chamber when the rule was taken up. How much time is provided for general debate and how is it divided?

The CHAIRMAN. General debate is not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 1327 pertains to United States Government life insurance issued on the 5-year level-premium term plan. It was introduced at the request of the American Legion, and has the indorsement of all the veterans' organizations. Since the first policies issued, the Congress has granted three renewals for periods of 5 years each, the last act being that of May 14, 1942, Public Law 556, Seventy-seventh Congress. Because the fourth 5-year period is expiring in many cases in 1947, this bill is necessary in order to provide an additional 5-year period of renewal. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported this bill unanimously.

Besides the precedent set up by Congress in permitting the continuance of this type of insurance, it must be remembered that the premiums charged on such insurance increase to that for the attained age upon the renewal for an additional 5-year period. Further, this type of policy applies to World War I veterans and a smaller number of peacetime veterans prior to October 8, 1940, when the National Service Life Insurance Act was approved.

It is the opinion of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that the privilege of renewing this type of policy at present should not be denied any veterans desiring to so renew. The committee takes the position that veterans who desire the protection of level-premium term insurance for themselves and their families during the years of the immediate future at a cost lower than that required to convert their policies to a permanent plan should not be denied the right to continue their term insurance. Those whose fourth 5-year period expires, for example, in 1947, and who have attained the age of 55 at time of renewal for a fifth period under the bill, will be required to pay a monthly premium of \$17.60 on a \$10,000 policy during such fifth 5-year period. If required to convert to an ordinary life policy at the attained age of 55, the monthly premium on a \$10,000 policy would be \$38.20 during the life of the policy.

As of December 31, 1946, there were in force 37,195 policies on the 5-year level-premium term plan; 12,821 were in their fourth 5-year period. As their policies expire, the bill authorizes renewal for a fifth 5-year period. As of the same date, there were 10,998 such policies in their first 5-year period, 7,215 in their second, and 6,161 in their third. Renewal for a fifth 5-year period in the latter cases would not take place until expiration of the fourth 5-year period.

The bill affords protection to those who have not converted and whose policies expire between January 24, 1947, and 5 months after the date of enactment of this bill. This is similar to the protection afforded by previous similar acts.

The Veterans' Administration has stated that it would be impossible to estimate the cost of this proposed legislation. The only additional cost to the Government, however, would be in those cases where the insured has a service-connected disability and it is later determined that death or permanent and total disability was due to the service-connected disability or the extra hazards of war. It should be pointed out, however, that the Government pays for the extra hazards, due to service, no matter what plan of insurance is involved.

The fact that out of the 37,195 policies on this plan, 26,197 are in the second, third, or fourth periods, and 12,821 are in the fourth period, makes it readily apparent that they must be good risks. Taking the group which would be immediately relieved by this bill, it should be remembered that they have been continuing their insurance in force by payment of premiums for 20 years, and therefore certainly must be considered to have been excellent risks.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that that request be made in the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, and so far as the Members on our side are concerned, we are not opposed to this legislation. It is the same legislation which came out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation several times during the years that I was chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last proviso of the first paragraph of section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended (47 Stat. 334; U. S. C., title 38, sec. 512), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That at the expiration of any 5-year period a 5-year level-premium term policy may be renewed for a second, third, fourth, or fifth 5-year period at the premium rate for the attained age without medical examination; and in case the 5-year period of any such policy shall have expired between January 24, 1947, and the expiration of 5 months after the date of the enactment of this amendment to this amendatory proviso and the policy has not been continued in another form of Government insurance such policy may be renewed as of the date of its expiration on the same conditions upon payment of the back premiums within 5 months after such date of enactment; and the Administrator of Vet-

erans' Affairs shall cause notice to be mailed to the holder of any such policy of the provisions of this amendment to this amendatory proviso."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "last" and insert the word "second."

Page 1, line 4, strike out "47 Stat. 334" and insert "by the act of May 14, 1942."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "level premium term" and insert "level-premium term."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "third, fourth," and insert "or third or fourth."

On page 2, line 2, insert the word "fourth" before the word "5-year."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RIZLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 1327 to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period, pursuant to House Resolution 138, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana what we may expect in the way of a program for next week.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it is our plan to call the Consent Calendar on next Monday. There are several bills on that calendar which should be disposed of.

Then we propose to call up House Joint Resolution 118, which is a bill from the Committee on Armed Services dealing with the matter of continuation of rub-

ber control. If that bill is not concluded on Monday, and it seems now it may not be concluded on Monday, it will be continued on Tuesday.

Also on Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar.

It is our plan to adjourn from Tuesday until Thursday.

Thursday it is proposed to call up a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, House Resolution 2413, to amend the Federal Reserve Act. Also if a rule is granted on the bill we shall try to call up House Resolution 1366, to facilitate the procurement of supplies and services by the War and Navy Departments.

Friday we propose to call up a bill which is to be reported, as I understand, from the Banking and Currency Committee, dealing with the matter of the extension of sugar control.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF NAVIGATION AND VESSEL INSPECTION LAWS AS APPLIED TO VESSELS OPERATED BY THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 131, which makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 1240.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 1240, a bill to provide for the suspension of navigation- and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

This is an open rule allowing 1 hour of general debate, at the conclusion of

which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. The rule also provides for one motion to recommend. There should be no opposition to this rule. This legislation has been requested by the President, and, I understand, was reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries with only one dissenting vote. This bill is necessary due to the fact the Second War Powers Act expires on March 31, and it is desired to continue certain powers contained therein beyond that date.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to explain the bill in detail. This is one of two bills reported by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee which extend powers contained in the Second War Powers Act. Both waive compliance with navigation laws for certain ships flying the American flag. This bill covers only those vessels operated by the War Department. These vessels cannot comply with present high safety standards, and it is proposed to suspend these inspection laws until December 31, 1947. Under the authority of the War Powers Act the President has waived these navigation and inspection laws. The War Department needs these vessels to carry displaced persons, to repatriate others, and to carry troops. Many months in dry dock would be required to refit these ships to meet the requirements set for passenger ships. Many of these ships were built as cargo vessels. They have no sprinkler systems in case of fire. They are equipped with only a minimum of lifeboats. However, no other passenger ships are available and these vessels must be used for the purposes indicated. The committee has pointed out that they are extremely reluctant to pass any legislation authorizing even a temporary lowering of the standards of safety at sea, but the present urgent need of these substandard vessels by the War Department makes this legislation necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, under the Second War Powers Act the Congress provided that—

The head of each department or agency responsible for the administration of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws is directed to waive compliance with such laws upon the request of the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of War to the extent deemed necessary in the conduct of the war by the officer making the request.

Please note that this is a mandatory provision. Compliance with the laws must be waived when requested by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy. It compels the Commandant of the Coast Guard, who is responsible for the enforcement of navigation and vessel-inspection laws in other than public vessels, to grant such waivers as may be requested, even though he thinks such action inadvisable.

Undoubtedly this was wise legislation for the period of the war—but the war is over and we should be getting back to a peacetime status once again.

The Secretary of the Navy has not made any request for a continuation of vessel inspection law waivers after

March 31, 1947, and it is therefore assumed that the Navy will not require such waivers. However, in the event the Navy should find a waiver needed in some isolated case it will be possible for such waiver to be granted in the discretion of the Commandant of the Coast Guard, provided House Joint Resolution 76, which will be considered after this bill has been acted upon, is enacted into law.

The Secretary of War has requested that he be granted authority to waive compliance with navigation and inspection laws, insofar as they pertain to vessels operated by the Army, until January 1, 1947, and it is the purpose of this bill to vest that authority in the Secretary of War in a somewhat more restricted sense than requested by him. This is brought about by the amendments suggested which, as you will note, authorize the granting of specific waivers only to vessels for which such waivers have been requested.

It is well to note here that the Army operates two distinct classes of ships; that is, public vessels and nonpublic vessels. Public vessels are covered by specific legislation and need not comply with vessel inspection and safety laws set forth for the operation of the merchant marine. However, as the safety standards required by our laws have been deemed advisable by Congress and have been enacted to provide the greatest safety for those traveling at sea, the Army should comply with these laws insofar as possible in its public vessels. I am glad to say that I am informed by the representatives of the War Department that it is the intention of that Department to bring all ships under its jurisdiction and operated as personnel carriers into full conformity with the vessel inspection and safety rules of the United States just as soon as money becomes available and time permits. A reasonable amount of money will be required to accomplish this end, and I urge that it be granted when requested as we in Congress owe the safety which will be achieved thereby to American citizens who must travel upon public vessels of the Army—we owe to them the same safety that they might expect if traveling on passenger ships operated by private interests under the American flag.

Nonpublic vessels operated under the jurisdiction of the Army are subject to all of the vessel inspection and safety requirements which are applicable to ships under the American flag engaged in passenger traffic and it is to these ships that the present proposed legislation will apply.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this rule so we may thoroughly discuss the merits of the issues presented in H. R. 1240.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. REEVES].

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in calling up H. R. 1240 and House Joint Resolution 76, which will follow, I am frank to say that I do so with a great deal of trepidation and with my fingers crossed. I am very grateful to my colleagues who, seemingly, because of the prompt action taken heretofore on other legislation we have brought before you, have such a high regard for the integrity and the seriousness with which the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries attack the various problems that are brought before us.

Very frankly, I personally do not like either of these two bills. I have grave misgivings about both of them. I regret that both of them carry my name, but they were introduced as a matter of emergency. H. R. 1240 was introduced at the request of the Secretary of War, and House Joint Resolution 76 was introduced at the request of the President in his message to the Congress on February 3, asking that we extend title V of the Second War Powers Act for 1 year.

Now, when I say I am fearful of these two bills, I say so because any time you tamper with safety standards—and the safety standards of the merchant marine under our laws are the most severe in the world—you are tampering with human life and the safety of human life. So, I do not like it. But, on the other hand, we have in effect a shotgun at our heads in the request for enactment of both of these bills. We have a great many people overseas that have to be transported back here. We have troops overseas that have to be transported to these shores. We have others who have to go abroad, and we simply do not have a passenger-carrying merchant marine afloat today that meets our safety standards that can take care of those people.

I am going to elaborate on the numbers of them when we get into the discussion of the bills themselves. But I say to you Members of the House that when the Army is operating ships designed for cargo carrying, and which meet all of our safety requirements for that purpose, and when you find it necessary to convert them into temporary troop transports, on which, in addition to troops, they are carrying women and children, the wives and families of our troops, overseas, and when they have lifeboat capacity for approximately 900 people and are carrying a total of 2,300, I think that that is not justified in peacetime, now or at any other time. Yet that is the testimony of the War Department.

I have a letter from a general which I shall include in the Record at this point:

MARCH 12, 1947.

HON. FRED BRADLEY,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BRADLEY: Confirming my telephone conversation with you this date, I would like to advise you on current Army practices regarding safety-at-sea observance on dependent-carrying vessels.

The current policy of the Transportation Corps is to sail no vessel in which the lifeboat capacity is not adequate to accommodate all members of the crew and all women

and children. Further, by "lifeboat capacity" is meant that actually certified by a United States Coast Guard representative.

I hope that this information will be of value to you and your committee.

Sincerely,

PAUL F. YOUNT,
Brigadier General,
Assistant Chief of Transportation.

I talked to the general last night, and he said he knew that I was going to introduce an amendment today to put an end to that practice, and he assured me last night that they were not carrying people beyond their lifeboat capacity. Captain BRADLEY inspected some of these ships just a week ago, or nearly a week ago, and he called our attention to the fact that 2,300 people were carried, with a lifeboat capacity for 900, and yet, as I understood the general last night, he said that they had stopped that practice now. He sent me a letter today in which he said that they are not carrying an excessive number of women and children beyond their lifeboat capacity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. But I say to you that maybe 1,000 additional soliders or 1,500 of them cast afloat on the North Atlantic today on life rafts can drown just as easily as any women or children. But the Army shrugs its shoulders at them—they are ordered to so travel.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. When wives and children join their families in Germany, are they traveling on boats that do not have adequate lifeboat capacity or other safety requirements?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. According to the general's letter, there is adequate lifeboat capacity for the women and children and crew members, but there may be 1,500 troops on board for which there is no lifeboat capacity.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to my beloved friend from California, the former ranking member of the committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee a question which has been asked me many times. Is it the intention of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to summon before the committee the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board and demand from them the reason why they discriminate against the American merchant marine in favor of foreign competitors by denying the right to American shippers to operate overseas air lines parallel to their present surface shipping routes?

I should like to know also if the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries intends to ascertain from the members of the Civil Aeronautics Board why they arrange landing places on American soil for our foreign

competitors while at the same time they deny this right to American shipping companies.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad my friend from California brought up that matter. We have pending before the Committee on Rules right now a bill which I introduced requesting that the rules of the House be so amended as to give our committee jurisdiction over the operation of aircraft by steamship companies parallel to their own routes. At the present time, as the gentleman knows, all jurisdiction with respect to air travel rests with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is all air travel whether it be trans-oceanic or domestic. We would like to bring them in, but I am sure the gentleman knows that the attitude of the Civil Aeronautics Board always has been and probably always will be that steamship lines, just the same as railroad lines, have no business getting into the air travel business at all.

Mr. WELCH. I will say to my friend that I was under the impression that authority had been granted to your committee by special resolution to summons witnesses and place them under oath.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It has not yet.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. We had that matter up before the Committee on Rules a week ago, but in view of the fact that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was not represented at that time no action was taken. We intend to discuss the bill further just as soon as we can. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the former chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman will recall that when the Civil Aeronautics Board was originally authorized by Congress they were very agreeable and made the statement that the merchant marine would take care of these matters.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There must have been a little double talk at the time, because they have certainly shown no inclination to give any of the steamship operators an opportunity to get into the air field.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Can the gentleman tell us what the safety record has been during the war period when, as I understand, these safety regulations have been waived?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Captain BRADLEY, as chairman of the subcommittee that handled these two bills, perhaps has more information than I, but as far as I know we have not had any loss of life attributable to these waivers of safety regulations. Commodore Shephard, who is in charge of the old Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, now known as the Bureau of

Marine Safety, when he testified before the committee told us it was because we have been mighty lucky. I know I can say that he casts no reflection whatsoever on the excellent seamanship of our officer personnel or our unlicensed personnel in the American merchant marine.

They have done an excellent heads-up job, but nevertheless when you are operating a ship carrying two or three thousand people with a lifeboat capacity for only 900 people across the North Atlantic in the middle of the winter, you cannot tell me we are not taking a chance.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS. My question is outside the scope of this particular legislation, but I will be happy to have the gentleman's views on it.

Former President Hoover has recommended to the President that shipping costs for relief supplies to Germany could be substantially reduced if we would permit Liberty ships which are now idle, as I understand, to be manned by German crews and used for that purpose.

Has the gentleman's committee taken any action along that line or does the gentleman's committee contemplate any such action?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. We have taken no action along that line to date. It has not been a matter of discussion before the committee. We have had no request from the White House or Mr. Hoover or anybody else to consider it. I think in due course we will want to consider it because it is a broad question of policy as to whether or not we want to carry this relief load at a higher cost under the American scale of wages and safety standards or whether we want to permit the Germans to haul it themselves for whatever wages they pay their own people. Of course, the basic operating costs will be the same so far as coal and oil are concerned.

Mr. VORYS. The charges for the crew could be paid in German marks and that would relieve to a certain extent the burden on the American taxpayers for getting the relief supplies over to the other side.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It is the old story that we had before the war. We could just simply put the food products on the docks here and then furnish the boats to haul it over and let them pay all the labor and operating costs of moving it.

Of course, as I understand it, Mr. Hoover's proposal is that we loan them these Liberty ships at a very nominal charge and unquestionably when we got them back—if we did get them back—they would be pretty well worn out because it is doubtful that they would receive any real maintenance. But if that is the way the foreign policy of the United States is to operate, so be it. I believe, however, that both your Committee on Foreign Affairs and my Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries are going to have to give this matter very careful study.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Could not the same condition apply to Japan?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. It could very easily.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, recently the San Francisco Examiner commemorated its sixtieth anniversary under its present owner, William Randolph Hearst. Throughout its 60 years the San Francisco Examiner has served the best interests of the development of San Francisco as a great international seaport city until today it is one of the world's greatest seaports.

The Examiner continues to follow that same policy by supporting the American merchant marine. Recently another editorial appeared in that newspaper dealing with the urgent need of American-flag shipping companies to have the right to operate overseas air lines parallel to their surface shipping lines.

The importance of the American merchant marine to the peacetime economy of this Nation has been demonstrated from the days of the American clipper ships down to the present. I believe every Member of this House is acquainted more or less with its history in the development of the foreign economy of our Nation.

More important than that, however, is the importance of the American merchant marine to our national defense, as was demonstrated in both World War I and World War II. It became one of the four major links in the chain of our national defense, along with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. It was the life line for supplies to our military and naval forces in every foreign theater of war.

I have repeatedly called attention of the House in years past to the crippling policy which has been followed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in denying the right, in accordance with the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, for the American merchant marine to operate air lines parallel to and as a component part of our surface shipping. Every foreign maritime nation has recognized the tremendous value accruing by coordinating their air lines and surface shipping by encouraging their ship operators to operate air lines as a basic part of their merchant marine in foreign surface. The Civil Aeronautics Board has aided these foreign countries by making arrangements for landing places for them in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that because of the prohibition placed by the Civil Aeronautics Board on American shipping companies from operating American air lines as a unit of their business, at least one American shipping company has gone into a foreign country to purchase control in a foreign flag aviation company in order that it can meet the competition of foreign ship operators.

In its strong editorial entitled "United States Shipping Lines Need Air Rights" the San Francisco Examiner called attention to the utterly preposterous situation being forced upon our American shipping companies by the actions of the Civil Aeronautics Board. That editorial is as follows:

UNITED STATES SHIPPING LINES NEED AIR RIGHTS

American shipping lines, custodians of the maritime enterprises of the United States which are inseparable from prosperous world commerce in peace and indispensable to successful national defense in war, are still waiting for a favorable decision by the American Government on their petition for equal air-sea rights with foreign competitors.

There is encouragement for the American maritime operators in the fact that the new Congress has shown an alert and sympathetic interest in this vital problem, and the several bills already introduced to equalize the world competitive conditions under which American ocean transport must operate seem assured of an early hearing.

But in the meantime it is still the policy of the American Government, as it has so long been, to deny American shipping lines the right to operate scheduled air service supplementary to and in coordination with established surface transport.

At the same time, it is still the parallel and incongruous policy of the American Government to freely grant this right to foreign commercial competitors, which are almost entirely organized on the basis of air-sea coordination either as private enterprise or Government monopoly.

This is an incomprehensible situation, flagrantly discriminatory against American shipping interests and potentially destructive of the American merchant marine on which so much depends in both peace and war, and yet the Civil Aeronautics Board persists in maintaining it.

Since the Civil Aeronautics Board continues to be adamant in this untenable position, there is no other recourse for the American shipping lines than that of appeal to Congress, with the whole future of prosperous American participation in world commerce hanging upon the outcome of their appeal.

It is utterly preposterous that an American steamship company, long established in the vital fields of ocean transport, should not be permitted to augment its services with supplementary air transport, when its foreign competitors are unreservedly and unhesitatingly allowed to do so.

This would be an understandable situation if the foreign governments having their own vital interests in the competing and coordinated foreign air-sea services were the authors of this crippling policy of discrimination and prohibition against the American companies. But it is our own American Government which thus strangely and adamantly imposes an impossible competitive condition upon the maritime interests of the United States.

If the American Government persists in this stupid policy, it will not only foreclose the American merchant marine against an effective and beneficial role in world commerce, but it will ultimately destroy the maritime mercantile establishments of the country and thus impair and impoverish our most essential instrument of national defense.

The new Congress should brook no delay in achieving a total reversal of American air-sea transportation policy, not only in the interest of assuring competitive equity to American maritime enterprise, but in the larger and more urgent interest of safeguarding American peace and security.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, in this period of transition from a wartime

to a peacetime economy when the Congress must take cognizance of the deliberate failure of the Civil Aeronautics Board to recognize the importance of the American merchant marine by enacting legislation that will directly impose upon the Civil Aeronautics Board the obligation to enable our American merchant marine to meet this foreign competition if it is to survive, or Congress must remove all jurisdiction from the Civil Aeronautics Board over the operation of overseas airlines by American shipping companies and vest it in the Maritime Commission.

(Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial from the San Francisco Examiner.)

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF NAVIGATION LAWS BY SECRETARY OF WAR

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, our chairman and Captain BRADLEY have told you what the bill purports to do. It deals with human life, principally the lives of those in the armed forces. The time allowed for general debate does not seem quite enough to discuss this proposition.

The War Department is asking the Congress to give it discretion to waive or suspend the operation of every law enacted by the Congress for the safety of those at sea. That means it would have the right to suspend everything in this book which contains the laws providing for safety at sea.

A civilian before going on a ship, if he knows that the ship does not comply with the regulations with reference to safety at sea, has a choice to ride or not to ride. Our soldiers in the armed forces who are in the service by reason of the selective service law, young men whom we are asking to enlist by the hundreds of thousands, will be herded on board these ships regardless of the laws of safety at sea that this Congress has enacted over a period of years. These boys will not have a choice of riding or not riding on unsafe ships. I think this is worthy of much discussion and much debate on both sides when you ask for authority to herd our own soldiers onto ships that do not have safety devices which are provided by the laws of the United States, resulting from experience over a number of decades.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL] has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1240, with Mr. HERTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat what I said a few minutes ago, that I ask for the consideration of this bill and for its passage with a certain amount of fear and trepidation.

The bill carries my name. It comes from the committee, of which I happen to be chairman, with almost a unanimous report. There was only one dissenting voice. If we should be so unfortunate at any time in the future as to have a serious accident—and it could happen—the Army will be pretty well protected. You do not need fear about that. You will never be able to put your finger on anybody in the Army and say they were responsible for the accident. You will not be able to put the blame on any of the bureaucrats. The finger will be on me—the Bradley bill from the Bradley committee, passed by the House of Representatives.

We have a great reputation in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and I want to maintain that reputation; but as I said previously, we have to move troops across the water. The Congress has authorized the moving of their families to join them, and bringing them back to this country. We certainly do not have adequate passenger merchant marine to take care of those people in a wholly safe manner. So the issue today is not whether it is a question of safety so much as do you want to leave those people over there indefinitely, carry food to them, let them live under unsanitary and unsatisfactory conditions as they are forced to do today? Do you want to leave a bunch of Nazis down here in South America which the State Department asked the Army to move out of those Latin-American countries back to Germany? There are about 5,800 of them. Do you want to take some of the displaced persons from Europe and transplant them to South America or elsewhere in order to take them off our hands over there in the occupied zones? Do you want to bring back the wives and children of our soldiers who are over-

seas? If you do, you have to bring them in the only bottoms that are available. That is the reason we have to pinch hit with these ships, many of which are cargo ships converted, with living quarters in the cargo hold that do not meet our safety standards with respect to fire hazards and so on, if we are going to move these people. That is all there is to it. That is why the War Department asked for these waivers on such ships as they are borrowing, if you please, from the merchant marine, which would otherwise be private ships. The safety-at-sea rules, of course, do not apply to War Department transports operated by the War Department.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that if we are to carry these people in our own ships we have no alternative other than to pass this legislation?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. That is absolutely true.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. And, as a matter of fact, is it not also true that even though we are going to have new passenger ships of standards in compliance with the safety-at-sea laws, it will be quite some time before they are available?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The reason we do not have passenger ships today, I may say to the gentleman from Washington, and as he knows, is because they are in drydock and repair yards being refitted for peacetime purposes following their wartime uses.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Yes; and in addition we have appropriated money for new passenger vessels which ships will not be available for some time.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. That is true.

I also wish to point out to the gentleman from Washington that when we talk about hauling these people in safe ships the argument is advanced that we might bring them over in foreign ships. Mr. Chairman, there is not a single foreign ship, there is not a ship outside of the American merchant marine, that can meet the safety requirements of this country. You talk about the *Queen Elizabeth*, and similar ships, there is not one of them that could sail under the American flag without a waiver from the Coast Guard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to impose upon the time of the Committee. The gentleman from California, the chairman of the subcommittee, in his address to the House during consideration of the rule, made a very clear, accurate, and, I think, complete statement of the purposes of this bill; and my distinguished friend the gentleman from Washington, in his query just now, emphasized what the chairman of the committee brought out very clearly—the fact that if we are to continue the very important and very necessary work upon which the War Department is now engaged, then we must pass this bill and pass it in short order. Unless this bill

becomes law by the 31st of March, title 5 of the Second War Powers Act will have expired; and unless this bill is passed, there will be no legislative authority to warrant or authorize American vessels to continue under the jurisdiction of the War Department transporting our troops, their wives and children, and do all of the other necessary things they now have to perform—services important to the destiny of the world.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Washington pointed out in his question, it is this bill or a complete cessation of the work of the War Department; the House has no other choice. It must adopt this bill, or it must handicap and, indeed, completely thwart and cripple the War Department in its work of carrying our troops all over the face of the world. I know the Congress has no disposition to take such action as will result in that situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of any time I myself have not used, and, with the permission of the gentleman in charge of the debate, I should like to yield such time as he may require to the distinguished former chairman of the committee and its present ranking minority member, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I can safely say that no man in this House today has more particular interest in safety legislation than I. I passed through the throes of the *Vestris* disaster, the *Mohawk* disaster, and the *Morro Castle* disaster, of which safety legislation was the logical result, and from the time of those disasters up to now I have been trying to secure the best safety legislation that could apply to the merchant marine.

Frankly, I am with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], in his support of this bill. I think he has stated the position well. I have no hesitancy, however, in saying that if there is any criticism at any time of his support of this bill or to the introduction of this bill, that criticism belongs to the two sides of the House. There has been no politics in this. Therefore, I fear no criticism. The gentleman from Washington, the gentleman from New Jersey, and the gentleman from Michigan have made it clear that this is necessary legislation in order that we may move our troops. We cannot recondition the old ships sufficiently fast to carry it out. The limitation that now applies under the War Powers Act expires on the 31st day of March, and you just simply cannot make your ships any better in that time. When you come to foreign ships we have the best and safest ships in the world, and there would be danger in foreign ships, certainly as much danger as could possibly exist with the legislation that we seek to put upon the books. This is necessary in order to accomplish the purposes which we have undertaken and to carry out not only the work of our merchant marine but the more important work which the War Department has undertaken and the important work that confronts us in the reconditioning of affairs in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that the bill may be enacted into law as speedily as possible.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

SAFETY AT SEA FOR SOLDIERS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the pending legislation covered by H. R. 1240 is one dealing with the lives of American citizens and particularly those in the armed forces who are performing military duties throughout the world, not only for the protection of America but that of other nations. The war has been over 2 years and now the War Department asks for a suspension of the laws with reference to safety at sea in the transportation of our 18- and 19-year-old boys to the four corners of the earth. With the billions that have been spent, it seems little thought has been expended to transport our armed forces on ships that meet the safety laws passed by the Congress of the United States. The War Department well knew that it would be transporting soldiers overseas and in these 2 years no safe ships are provided. And now with an excuse that the War Powers Act might not be extended, the War Department asks that it be given the authority to suspend every law with reference to safety at sea in its use of the ships to transport those in the armed forces. The shipyards of this country did not close on the day of the ending of the war, but the War Department has not used the shipyards to provide safe ships for the transportation of those in the armed forces. Since the ending of the war the shipyards of this country surely could have provided in 2 years safe ships for the transportation of our armed forces. It seems to me that the providing of safe ships for our soldiers in time of peace should have been the very first order of business during the past 2 years since the ending of the war. Hundreds of ships are laid up and out of commission, yet in the name of this neglect and inefficiency of the War Department, in not taking every shipyard facility in the United States to make safe ships, the Congress is asked to set aside and suspend the law for safety at sea, especially in the transportation of our young soldiers overseas. I believe the Congress should give every safety protection to the soldiers of our country, and should not make it possible for bureaus and departments to jeopardize their safety because of past failures.

When it comes time for amendments I would like to offer for your consideration an amendment that might save many lives.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, the United States has the greatest safety standards of any nation in the world today on maritime affairs. It is not without regret that we are forced at this time to pass this legislation. We have no choice in the matter. Even the great *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Queen Mary* today, in peacetime, would not be allowed to sail under the American flag, except on waivers because those two

great ships do not comply with American safety standards. So, you see, we have set our sights very, very high, and laudably so. But we must not hamstring the Army, because there are no ships afloat today that can meet our requirements. The Army must be permitted to carry on its great duties and tasks.

We had one ship, I believe, that met all necessary requirements, and that was the *America*, and I read only about a week ago that on her last trip she had to sail under waivers. Our War Department and our Army and Navy are not going to permit our boys and girls to sail in tubs. The ships may not meet all safety requirements, but all those requirements which are practicable under the circumstances, I am sure, will be met. This legislation permits the War Department to waive present requirements until December 31, 1947.

Under the circumstances we have only what is called Hobson's choice.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I cannot bring myself to vote for a bill that would force some of the soldiers who are overseas, to the number of half a million or more, to ride home in Government vessels which are without even ordinary safety requirements, with danger to their lives, and, when accompanied by their wives and children, with danger to the wives and children, all because Congress and the War Department have not met this situation in time. It is true that the war has been over 2 years. There has been ample opportunity for everybody in authority to know that this war act expires on the 31st day of March. Because of the fact that we have done nothing about the matter now we are about to urge, or to command, or to demand, that these soldier boys of ours overseas ride home in unsafe vessels.

If the safety regulations adopted by Congress were not wise at the time they were enacted, then they are not wise today, but if they were wise when enacted and were intended to save human life, then there is no reason why Congress now should reverse its action and sanction risking the lives of our soldiers, those now overseas and those who will continue to be sent abroad by even authorizing the War Department, the Coast Guard, or any other Government agency to waive even ordinary safety requirements in the ships on which they sail. Even permitting civilian people to run such risks voluntarily should be made a crime. Packing and overloading ships carrying soldiers may become a crime of vast significance. I shall not vote for such a measure. I do not want to be a party to sending word to the parents, wives, other relatives of the soldiers that our great Government will approve such dangerous methods and measures.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, at the present time, as an aftermath of the war, the Army is operating a number of C-4's—about 13 just

now—designed as cargo vessels, but used as troop-carriers during the war. These ships transported hundreds of thousands of American military personnel during and after the war with an admirable safety record. Under normal conditions they should all be retired from service, but there are large troop movements which must be made, and there are great numbers of other personnel attached to various Army activities, such as dependents, military government officials and families, and so forth, which must be moved, and, since the capacity of public vessels and of vessels now operated by private interests is totally inadequate to care for this necessary transportation, it is imperative that these C-4's be continued in operation until other ships may become available. In fact, there is no other solution to the problem, unless we are to discontinue many of our activities entirely as there are neither other American ships nor foreign-flag ships available to take the places of these C-4's.

These particular ships do not comply with our laws and cannot be made to do so without very extensive conversions involving long delays and huge costs. Their design, as cargo ships, makes conversion to accepted passenger standards practically out of the question. I cite here a few of the known deficiencies: The lifeboats and lifesaving equipment in general were designed for the purpose of handling troops while the ships were carrying out their wartime duties, chiefly as attack transports. In the performance of such duties quick lowering of boats at sea was of secondary importance, as the purpose of the ships was to transport numbers of men into harbors, in relatively smooth water, where the boats could be handled by power apparatus and put in the water as required to disembark troops in landing operations. Naturally, lifeboats which normally require power for launching are not deemed at all satisfactory for saving of life at sea where it may be necessary to launch boats without power, due to failure of the vessel's power plant on account of flooding or other damage. It is not likely that this will occur, and it is to be assumed, therefore, that the boats could be launched at sea in the event of disaster. However, in all of our rules for the saving of life at sea we choose to rule out everything which might be questionable, and so we would not ordinarily choose this type of launching apparatus for the boats of passenger vessels. These ships carry ample life-raft equipment. In some cases they are rigged for quick launching and in others they are rather unavailable in emergencies. All such vessels carry adequate life preservers, but life preservers, in themselves, must not be considered as adequate replacements for boat capacity in the North Atlantic in wintertime.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think the gentleman would agree with me that neither a life preserver nor a life raft would be much protection on the North Atlantic at this time of year.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. They would be no protection whatsoever, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan.

These vessels do not comply with the requirements insofar as fire protection is concerned. They are of steel construction and have very little combustible material on board. They do not, however, have the sprinkler systems, the fire-detecting system, or the fire-resisting bulkheads required by our laws.

In a ship with large amounts of wood used in her interior construction, I should consider these faults grave, indeed, but in these C-4's they are greatly minimized by the fact that there is so little wood anywhere on board.

There are some doors through vertical transverse bulkheads below the water line. These are very substantial and, I am informed, are closed and secured prior to the ship's departure from port. If the doors are kept closed, they are not any detriment to safety. These doors are not fitted with remote control from the bridge, but many of them are fitted with mechanical control from a nearby station.

The living quarters on these ships are extremely poor. They are, in fact, merely troop quarters converted for other purposes.

There are other minor deficiencies such as lack of required communication systems, but none of these are such as to greatly imperil the ship.

I do not consider these ships as dangerous; in fact, they are as safe as most ships now operating under foreign flags, but neither do I consider them as safe or suitable for operation under the American flag in the service of the Army under ordinary conditions.

I spent the last two week-ends inspecting various vessels under the American flag—including some of those operated under the jurisdiction of the Army. In one case I found that a C-4, Army operated, made a westbound trans-Atlantic passage in December 1946 with a total of 2,063 passengers, which meant that the ship had a total of over 2,300 people on board. As her lifeboat capacity is only 1,048 and as her other buoyant equipment would have been rather useless in the North Atlantic in winter weather, I consider this to have been an unjustifiable risk of life and I call upon the War Department to reduce materially the number of passengers carried on board such a vessel at any one time even though transportation is delayed and personnel inconvenienced. May I repeat, that the war is over, and that the American public will not look with equanimity upon a preventable maritime disaster even though the War Department may be clear of legal responsibility under waiver of vessel-inspection laws by act of Congress. Being sorry will not bring back human life. The time for the War Department to act is now.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WEICHEL. The bill presently under consideration gives the War Department absolute authority to do the very thing we asked them not to do.

There is no limitation in this bill whatsoever, is there?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I appreciate that, but I may say I feel no doubt whatever but that the War Department will comply with our wishes in the question. I feel we must allow some discretion to the responsible officers of the War Department. I have been assured already that they will comply with our wishes in every way.

Mr. WEICHEL. After they have been given full authority you think they will better comply than when they do not have authority to waive the rules and regulations?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio I am sure they will comply with them. I intend to continue looking at their ships and spreading the information on the record if they do not comply. I feel no doubt but what they will comply.

Certain testimony before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries indicates that efforts will be made to obtain the use of some of these C-4's under the jurisdiction of the Army for the transportation of displaced persons from Europe to South America and for other purposes alien to usual War Department uses. While it is no part of my prerogative to determine upon the necessity of moving these displaced persons, I do feel that the War Department should not utilize these vessels upon which waivers have been requested—ostensibly for the proper accomplishment of legitimate duties of that Department—for the transportation of great numbers of people of all ages and sexes on long voyages to different parts of the world. If the need for such transportation is imperative, and the War Department feels that it is the proper agency to provide it, I believe that the Secretary of War should make request to the Congress for specific authority in the premises rather than going into the world passenger-carrying business with ships which do not comply with our minimum safety standards of which the use is permitted, only because of the emergency conditions existing in our own maritime establishment.

The War Department has stated that it expects the need for these vessels on which waivers are being requested to be ended by January 1, 1948.

Mr. Chairman, under the conditions existing, I believe that this bill, as amended, should receive the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have an opportunity this afternoon, while the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries is reporting out a bill from that very excellent committee, with whose work I have been quite familiar over a period of years, to call to their attention a matter of special interest, par-

ticularly to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], former chairman of that committee, and his colleagues, many of whom are serving today as they have for several years past. I call attention to the desperate plight in which the fisheries industry of this country finds itself.

Only within the past few minutes I have been handed an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal relative to the tremendous imports of fish from foreign countries. When we speak of fish coming to this country we speak of another manufactured product. We speak in the same sense that we spoke yesterday when we spoke of copper coming from foreign countries in competition with the copper mined in this country.

Today we are facing a condition in this country as the result of development of industries abroad, where low wages and poor working conditions exist, that unless some protection is set up in the form of a tariff wall or a quota, our industries in this country will be deluged with competition from foreign sources.

The article in the Wall Street Journal which I wish to call to the attention of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and also to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee which considers tariff legislation, states:

Visions of being swamped in a tidal wave of foreign fish have United States commercial fishermen blue around the gills.

Already the wave is wildly splashing over the tariff wall. And State Department talk of knocking a few stones from the top of that wall puts the fishermen through a St. Vitus dance.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Does the gentleman recall that during the war, under the terms of lend-lease, we took some Russian ships belonging to our friends over there and reconditioned them and made floating cannons out of them in our own shipyards, under lend-lease?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is true. Of course, some of those ships, under lend-lease, have been converted to great refrigerator ships, probably to which the gentleman refers. But I wish to call to the attention of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries that the imports of fish today constitute over 40 percent of the entire production of what we call fish filets in the New England area. That is fish from which the bone is taken and made available to the markets in this country. It is over 40 percent of what we produce in the New England area.

This article refers to the situation that exists in Seattle. Out of a fleet of 350 "otter" trawlers, the type used in catching fish for filets, only a lonely 25 are now in operation. The rest are idle. They cannot operate at high cost against the competition of outside fish prices that they enumerate in this article. We see the spirit of the totalitarian states spreading over Europe, and we see the nationalization of industries taking place in those countries. The industries themselves are subsidized and the industries

pay atrociously low wages to their employees, who must work under the most deplorable conditions. We simply cannot compete against such conditions and maintain our industrial working class in the United States.

I am making these few statements to this Committee and to the Ways and Means Committee only to indicate that a full study must be made of the over-all and most pressing problem confronting our industries, particularly the fishing, shoe, and textile industries. As soon as Europe and Asia rehabilitate their industry and commerce we shall feel the brunt of their competition. While we, of course, are happy to help them, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MEADE].

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I represent one of the largest shipbuilding districts in the United States. I rise in support of the bill, but I support it with the greatest reluctance. I support it simply because it seems to me to be the only thing to do under the circumstances.

It is, indeed, a sad commentary on our short-sightedness and lack of planning for our future self-protection to have safety laws but no ships capable of complying with them. I, therefore, call upon this Congress to give the most careful consideration to seeing that proper appropriations are made so that we can have sufficient passenger cargo ships of modern design and meeting proper safety standards, so that American ships can take their proper place on the seven seas of the world and so the American merchant marine will be second to none.

The Congress of the United States, through the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, established a United States Maritime Commission and directed that organization "to further the development and maintenance of an adequate and well-balanced American merchant marine, promote the commerce of the United States, and to aid in the national defense." Today we find the Maritime Commission and the merchant marine in the very peculiar position of having carried out its directives too well.

The Maritime Commission which we established had hardly wet its feet in a sound program for our merchant marine industry when war broke out in Europe and when this Nation was drawn into the turmoil through the bombing of Pearl Harbor. We, as a nation, and many of the young men in our armed forces who returned home safely, can thank our lucky stars that the program of the Maritime Commission was established and working when we went to war. In World War I the shipyards of this country, tremendous though they were, failed to deliver a single newly constructed dry-cargo vessel before the armistice was signed. Our men and equipment were transported on foreign-flag ships.

During the first year of the recent hostilities the merchant shipyards of the Nation, under the direction of the United States Maritime Commission, delivered more than 8,000,000 deadweight tons of cargo shipping into the service of the Allies. The shipbuilding know-how, developed under the 1936 act and vital to the Nation, was paying big dividends. The next year 16,000,000 tons were delivered, and by the middle of the third year the shipping needs of our United Nations had been largely met and our supplies flowed overseas on a bridge of ships. That bridge of ships saved thousands of lives and made a vital contribution to an early end of hostilities. These same ships continued to serve the world in its rehabilitation and relief.

Today that Commission, with its war task successfully accomplished, stands in the unique position of having the world's largest merchant fleet, yet vitally lacking in the elements of a well-balanced fleet, as directed by the Merchant Marine Act.

War did not require the building of passenger-type vessels, except as troop ships, nor did it require the building of the latest modern technically improved cargo ships. War demanded only that we get the ships quickly and move great weights of cargoes overseas. Cargo ships became as much an implement of war as tanks, bombers, and battleships.

In the early days of the war our entire passenger fleet was extensively converted in that other phase of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—the national defense. The one-hundred-and-thirty-odd passenger vessels in the active American flag service in June of 1939 became the troop ships and special-service ships of the armed services that carried our men safely overseas.

Of that prewar merchant fleet more than one-third were over 20 years of age, the legal lifetime set by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It was part of the Maritime Commission's program to replace these passenger ships as they reached the end of their longevity. War prevented the orderly procedure outlined by the Maritime Commission. That passenger-ship operation is vital to the merchant-marine industry, can best be pointed out by a situation which existed prior to the war. In 1 day foreign-flag ships, in competition with American-flag ships, carried out of New York Harbor 5,000 passengers, most of them American, skimming the cream from some \$1,500,000 worth of business. The United States needs passenger ships to carry our businessmen and the products of America to the whole world.

Today the United States merchant marine faces world competition again. Practically every maritime nation in the world is rushing the completion of the most modern merchant fleet, including adequate passenger transportation facilities, yet the shipyards of America have not laid a single keel to replace the vessels lost in war service or those which have become over-age, or those whose extensive military conversion makes it too expensive to reconvert them.

Great Britain alone is building 454 vessels; Holland, 91; Italy, 87; Sweden, 66; Norway, 62; and France, 58. Among

these vessels are passenger vessels designed to once again skim the cream of American travelers. Compared to these fleets, American shipyards have under construction some 64 vessels, of which the major portion are cargo types carrying relatively few passengers and designed for specific trades.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives has recently held hearings and approved the extension of waiver privileges to the Coast Guard in order that the vital need for passenger ships might be met through the use of troopships and other vessels which do not meet American standards.

We do not want, and we must not, continue to use these ships beyond the existing emergency. We should replace them with adequate passenger tonnage designed to keep the American flag in the world's passenger business. The Merchant Marine Act directs the Maritime Commission to build a fleet composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, yet today, in the North Atlantic, there is only one passenger ship carrying the Stars and Stripes which meets all the Coast Guard requirements and American standards. That is the flagship of our merchant fleet—the *America*—the largest vessel ever built in this country and admittedly the safest ship afloat. We need more ships with those same characteristics. Some of our prewar passenger vessels are still operating in emergency service under waivers from the Coast Guard. A few are in various stages of reconversion to resume their passenger runs. At the moment that is all that is being done to meet this critical situation, and it falls far short of meeting the directives of the Congress.

A year ago the United States Maritime Commission approved 31 ocean-trade routes essential to the economy and defense of this Nation. How essential these routes were was felt by the people of this Nation when our coffee cups and sugar bowls ran dry. Foreign shipping, upon which we had come to depend, was withdrawn from our shores by the war in Europe. The mother countries had called home their fleets for their defense.

In view of these essential trade routes, the Maritime Commission has set up minimum requirements for each route, establishing the number of vessels and the type of service believed to be essential to meet the directives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The Maritime Commission had laid plans for the design of vessels it anticipated would be required to meet such services. The Commission had received bids on three vessels to be placed in the North Atlantic-Mediterranean run, but deferred construction of these vessels at the request of the administration until such time as materials might be more available. Other ships were on the drawing boards which would place the United States merchant fleet in a truly competitive position with foreign-flag vessels and meet the directives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. However, unless the Congress provides the funds necessary to carry out the directives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 the hands of the

United States Maritime Commission are tied and each day our merchant fleet loses its equitable share of world trade and foreign commerce.

It is my belief that all agencies of Government should cooperate in supporting this Nation's position in all phases of our endeavor to create a world united in lasting peace. As the Maritime Commission bent its efforts to aid the armed services in winning the war and, following the end of the war, carried out the requests of the United Nations and the United States Government in the rehabilitation of the world, so should our peacetime government in all its elements support our peacetime merchant marine. I therefore urge that this Congress give full consideration to the carrying out of the directives so clearly stated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, "It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a merchant marine," adequate to carry a substantial share of our world trade and to serve in our Nation's defense, a truly well-balanced merchant marine.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the termination of title V of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as last amended by the act of June 29, 1946 (Public, No. 475, 79th Cong.), and upon request of the Secretary of War to the head of each department or agency responsible for the administration of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, the operation of all such laws shall be suspended in relation to all vessels operated by the War Department: *Provided*, That such suspension shall be effective only until December 31, 1947.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, at the end of line 8, insert "of which suspension is so requested."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 1, after the word "department", insert "as to which such suspension has been requested."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: Page 2, line 4, after the date "1947", insert a paragraph as follows:

"*Provided further*, That the operation of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws requiring specified lifesaving equipment shall not be so suspended."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, it can be readily seen that there should be offered to the soldier in the armed forces some little protection. Even though there might be a so-called necessity to waive every law protecting those at sea during the war, I hardly see that need in peacetime. But if you want to give this authority to the War Department to waive every law with reference to safety at sea and permit the herding of

our soldiers on ships, I ask you at least to consider this amendment whereby the War Department cannot suspend the specific laws with reference to lifesaving equipment on a ship.

That is all I have to say with reference to the amendment I have offered. I ask that you give the soldier at least this little bit of protection.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of the pending amendment would practically make the entire bill useless. The fundamental difficulties of the ships which are covered are deficiencies in lifesaving arrangements. Those deficiencies are primarily due to war conditions. As I explained to you, most of these ships for which we are requesting waiver are those which were built for the purpose of landing troops in various harbors where invasions were contemplated and where you had ample time to pick your boats up with power, put your troops in, and launch them. The double-bank boats were entirely satisfactory also. However, that type of davit is not acceptable to the Coast Guard and is not acceptable under the safety laws of the United States. Our safety laws require davits for ships carrying passengers to be such that the lifeboats may be launched without power. That is, you may drop certain chocks, push your boats and davit out, and lower away. You cannot do that in many ships fitted for combat service.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POTTS. Does the gentleman understand that the ships which are operated have adequate lifesaving boats and equipment of that type?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Some of them have that type of davit and some are a slightly different type, which is more acceptable.

Mr. POTTS. They all have sufficient lifeboats to take care of the people who are carried in the ships?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. They all have sufficient boats to take care of the people whom I contemplate the War Department will be carrying in the ships. As I said in my previous talk, they are carrying sometimes twice as many people now as they have boat capacity for, but we contemplate that will stop and the War Department has assured me it will stop.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Are the men to be allowed their choice in taking these boats?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. There is no choice, as far as I know. There are no other ships. If the Army must go it must go in the type of ships that are available. If the public or dependents wish to go on that type of ship they have the privilege of going. If they do not want to travel on that type of ship

they must stay at home because there are no other ships.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Do they know what kind of ships they are sailing in?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I would assume the Army people know what they are getting into. I may also assure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the Army has an almost perfect record during the war and since the war in the operation of these ships. Personally, I do not like it, but there is no other choice that I can see.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They can find no other ships?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. There are no ships available in the world today except these. It is the general impression that we stand in a very fine position insofar as the merchant marine is concerned, but we have never been in such a sad condition in the history of the United States so far as I know concerning passenger ships.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No effort has been made to find out the feelings of the people who want to go on those ships?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1240) to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 131, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement he made last Monday before the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include articles in each.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

WAIVING COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN NAVIGATION AND VESSEL-INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 130 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of House Joint Resolution 76, authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

Mr. Speaker, this House joint resolution is almost identical to the bill which the House has just passed, H. R. 1240. This measure covers all vessels operated by our merchant marine, while the previous legislation referred only to vessels belonging to and operated by the War Department. These ships are urgently needed, but cannot meet the high safety standards now required. For this reason, the authority to waive inspection laws must be continued after the expiration of the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been reported, as I understand, by unanimous vote of your committee. A rule was also granted by unanimous vote.

Because it is my aim to expedite the business of the House, and having no requests for time, the gentleman may move the previous question.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night to file reports on House bill 2535 and House Joint Resolution 146.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

WAIVING COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN NAVIGATION AND VESSEL-INSPECTION LAWS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 76, with Mr. GAMBLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have previously explained, in the debate on the bill H. R. 1240, the fears I have with respect to that legislation as well as the pending legislation which, as the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH], of the Rules Committee, has said, are identical in their purposes. This bill applies, of course, to civilian vessels, the inspection laws covering which are administered by the commandant of the Coast Guard through the Bureau of Marine Safety.

There are two basic questions to be considered in the waiving of these laws in this particular case as applied to civilian vessels. The first one has to do with the waiving of the safety requirements; and the same arguments advanced as to the bill H. R. 1240 apply generally to this particular bill, except for the fact that in most instances, I think practically in all instances, we have had no evidence that these ships have been overloaded to the extent of the Army ships in the movement of their people.

The second phase has to do with the waiving of the safety requirements with

respect to the crews; that is, the waiving of the employment of a certain percentage of aliens in a crew.

Now, to touch on the first question: Again we come up against the problem that we have a lot of people to be moved all over the world; and the only way we can move them is in the bottoms that are presently available, because there are not sufficient passenger ships available today.

As I previously said, most of them are in the shipyards being reconverted from their wartime service. There are only five passenger ships operating on the oceans of the world today that would come up to our safety requirements and can be operated without waiver. There is the liner *America*, which is the safest ship afloat. There are three ships being operated in the South American trade. There is also one ship operating on the Pacific. That is the whole list of the American passenger merchant marine as of today that can operate without these waivers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at this point, under authority granted me previously today in the House, I want to incorporate a tabulation of the passenger ships operating in the United States North Atlantic ports, European Atlantic, and Mediterranean ports, as furnished to our Committee by Commander Parkhurst of the Maritime Commission. Remember, if you will, what I previously said today, that our safety standards are the highest in the world and we have testimony before our committee that there is not a single flagship today that can measure up to our standards and Americans are traveling on them. So when people try to tell you, or scare headlines cry out, we are carrying people in an unsafe manner in the American merchant marine, just remember that these foreign flagships, in my opinion, are by and large not as safe as the ships for which these waivers are presently being asked. Also, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the Membership of this House look over the total carrying capacity of the present passenger-carrying merchant marine as contrasted with those of foreign flags and then ask yourselves whether the American merchant marine is today paramount on the high seas. It certainly is not and it is to our disgrace that it is not. It is about time we wake up, if we would maintain the American merchant marine paramount.

We have to have appropriations to build ships, if we are to compete in the world trade. We must have comparable operating costs, and that includes labor costs. Above all, we must have courteous crews. We must have a cuisine equal to that on foreign ships. In short we must realize that as of today we cannot maintain the American flag paramount on the high seas as far as passenger carrying is concerned, unless we wake up; and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] pointed out earlier today, we must permit the American merchant marine to operate aircraft in the world trade paralleling their own steamship routes, on many of which we pay a handsome subsidy from the American taxpayers' pockets.

Passenger service, present and anticipated, 1947-48, United States North Atlantic ports to European Atlantic and Mediterranean ports
UNITED STATES FLAG

Operator and name of vessel	Passenger capacity by classes	Service	Remarks
UNITED STATES			
United States Lines:			
<i>America</i>	First, 519; cabin, 541; tourist, 189; total, 1,049.....	New York to Cobb, Southampton, Le Havre.....	Now operating.
<i>Washington</i>	Cabin, 578; third, 141; tourist, 268; total, 1,087.....	do.....	Now operating under waiver.
<i>John Ericsson</i>	Cabin, 227; third, 888; tourist, 398; total, 1,513.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Marine Marlin</i>	Cabin, 228; dormitory, 208; troop, 490; total, 926.....	Ireland, England, France, Germany.....	Do.
<i>Marine Flasher</i>	Cabin, 230; dormitory, 192; troop, 492; total, 914.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Ernie Pyle</i>	Cabin, 228; dormitory, 192; troop, 444; total, 864.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Marine Falcon</i>	Cabin, dormitory, troop, 900, approximate.....	do.....	Do.
American Export Line:			
<i>Saturnia</i> (Italian flag), American Export Line, agents.....	First, 249; third, 555; tourist, 406; total, 1,313.....	New York to Mediterranean.....	Vessel under Italian registry; now operating.
<i>Vulcania</i> (Italian flag), American Export Line, agents.....	First, 330; third, 625; tourist, 376; total, 1,331.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Marine Shark</i>	Cabin, 230; dormitory, 240; troop, 460; total, 930.....	Italy.....	Now operating under waiver.
<i>Marine Carp</i>	Cabin, 244; dormitory, 192; troop, 429; total, 865.....	Levant.....	Do.
<i>Marine Perch</i>	Cabin, 244; dormitory, 192; troop, 465; total, 901.....	Azores, Portugal, Italy.....	Do.
FOREIGN FLAG			
BRITISH			
Cunard White Star Line, Ltd.:			
<i>Queen Elizabeth</i>	First, 850; cabin, 720; tourist, 774; total, 2,344.....	New York to Southampton.....	Now operating.
<i>Aquitania</i>	Cabin, 523; third, 1,150; tourist, 355; total, 2,028.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Franconia</i>	Cabin, 260; third, 270; tourist, 350; total, 880.....	New York to Liverpool, Belfast.....	Do.
<i>Queen Mary</i>	Cabin, 735; tourist, 760; third, 580; total, 2,075.....	New York to United Kingdom and France.....	Expected to return to service late spring or early summer of 1947.
<i>Manretania</i> (nev.).....	Cabin, 486; tourist, 393; third, 412; total, 1,291.....	do.....	Ready March 1947.
<i>Britannic</i>	Cabin, 504; tourist, 551; third, 466; total, 1,521.....	do.....	Ready June 1947.
<i>Caronia</i>	Cabin, 486; tourist, 393; third, 412; total, 1,291.....	New York to United Kingdom.....	Under construction.
<i>Media</i>	Total, 250.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Parthia</i>	do.....	do.....	Do.
Johnston & Warren Line:			
<i>Newfoundland</i>	First, 75; tourist, 80; total, 155.....	Boston to Liverpool.....	Do.
<i>Nova Scotia</i>	do.....	do.....	Do.
CANADIAN			
Canadian Pacific:			
<i>Empress of Canada</i> (ex-Duchess of Richmond).....	Cabin, 571; tourist, 480; third, 508; total, 1,559.....	Montreal to Liverpool.....	Ready April 1947.
<i>Empress of India</i> (ex-Duchess of Bedford).....	do.....	do.....	Ready late 1947.
NETHERLANDS			
Holland-American Line:			
<i>Edam</i>	Cabin, 28.....	New York to Rotterdam.....	Now operating.
<i>Noordam</i>	Tourist, 123.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Westerdam</i>	First, 90.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Veendam</i>	Cabin, 260; tourist, 275; third, 240; total, 775.....	New York to Holland and United Kingdom.....	Ready March 1947.
<i>Nieuw Amsterdam</i>	Cabin, 531; tourist, 494; third, 200; total, 1,225.....	New York to Holland.....	Ready summer 1947.
FRENCH			
French Line:			
<i>Ile de France</i>	Cabin, 561; third, 440; tourist, 475; total, 1,476.....	New York to Cherbourg.....	Now operating.
<i>Oregon</i>	Cabin, 37.....	New York to Havre.....	Do.
<i>Wisconsin</i>	Cabin, 40.....	New York to France.....	Do.
<i>De Grasse</i>	Cabin, 325; tourist, 215; third, 230; total, 790.....	do.....	Ready 1948.
<i>Liberte</i> (ex-Europa).....	Cabin, 545; tourist, 577; third, 859; total, 1,981.....	do.....	Do.
SWEDISH			
Swedish American Line:			
<i>Gripsholm</i>	Cabin, 182; third, 402; tourist, 494; total, 1,578.....	New York to Goteborg.....	Now operating.
<i>Drottningholm</i>	Cabin, 182; third, 502; tourist, 277; total, 961.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Stockholm</i>	Cabin, 50.....	New York to Sweden.....	Under construction.
NORWEGIAN			
Norwegian-America Line: Starangafford			
Cabin, 100; third, 600; tourist, 200; total, 900.....	New York to Norway.....	Now operating.	
DANISH			
East Asiatic Line:			
<i>Falstria</i>	First, 50.....	New York to Copenhagen, Gdynia.....	Do.
<i>Jyllandia</i>	First, 55.....	do.....	Do.
POLISH			
Gdynia America Line: Hatory			
Tourist, 360; third, 402; total, 762.....	New York to Gdynia.....	Ready April 1947.	
SPANISH			
Compania Trasatlantica (Spanish line):			
<i>Marques de Comillas</i>	First, 149; second, 53; third, 899; total, 1,101.....	New York to Bilbao, Cadiz.....	Now operating.
<i>Magallanes</i>	First, 139; second, 842; third, 52; total, 1,033.....	do.....	Do.
<i>Olympia</i>	650.....	New York to Mediterranean.....	Do.
PORTUGUESE			
Companhia Nacional De Navegacao: Lourenco Marques			
First, 128; second, 93; third, 80; total, 301.....	New York to Lisbon.....	Do.	
PANAMANIAN			
Greek Line (Greek): Katoomba			
Total, 563.....	New York to Italy, Greece.....	Do.	
ITALIAN			
Italia Line: Ferruccio Buonapace			
Total, 150.....	New York to Mediterranean.....	Under construction.	

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Research Division.

We have about 40,000 American citizens overseas who were trapped there during the war and are anxious to get back to this country. They are anxious to move in anything that will float, with a reasonable degree of safety. These ships, while they are still operating under waiver, are reasonably safe. As the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] pointed out as to the last bill, the biggest hazard on these ships is the question of fire protection. They do have sufficient lifeboat capacity on these ships as they are now being operated. Many of them are converted cargo carriers, C-4's, as we call them. Some of them are known as what they call dormitory ships, which are just exactly what the term signifies. They have large dormitories for men, women, and children, and central lavatory facilities, sanitation facilities, and so forth.

We have about 75,000 displaced persons in Europe today being fed by the army of occupation forces. We have to feed them or move them. We are trying to repatriate some of these people just where they are, and some we are trying to move down to South America, so that they can settle there where there is territory for them in which to live. They have to be moved by somebody. Our State Department wants us to do it and we are trying our best to do it.

As I previously said, something like 5,800 dangerous Nazis, in the opinion of our State Department and Army officials, ought to be moved out of South America back to Germany. We have a certain number of people who have to go abroad either for their own private business or on the business of the Government. Those people have to be moved. We simply have to take advantage of the bottoms that exist.

With reference to this manning situation, there we have a situation we do not like. I do not know how many of you have had an opportunity to read the RECORD of yesterday. I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD yesterday, page A969, some correspondence that I had with Mr. Phil Murray calling attention to a telegram which he sent me on February 25 last, in which he complained that we were selling our ships, both privately owned and Government owned, out of the surplus fleet, for operation under the Panamanian and Honduran flags.

In a conference this morning with Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the CIO National Maritime Union, and Mr. Harry Lundberg, president of the Seafarers' International Union, representing two of the largest maritime unions, they complained that we were selling ships to Greece and other countries for operation under foreign flags. The figures which I shall put in the RECORD do not bear out their statements to quite the degree that they had previously been informed, and they admitted that they had no definite figures.

I shall insert in the RECORD figures from the Maritime Commission:

American-owned vessels transferred to Honduran or Panamanian registry, July 1, 1946, to Jan. 31, 1947

	Domestic-owned		Foreign-owned		Total	
	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons	Number	Gross tons
Privately owned:						
Dry cargo.....	15	54,669	36	192,862	51	247,531
Tankers.....	5	38,864	2	15,597	7	54,461
Total.....	20	93,533	38	208,459	58	301,992
Government-owned:						
Dry cargo.....	18	116,843	41	272,588	59	389,431
Tankers.....	5	43,305			5	43,305
Total.....	23	160,148	41	272,588	64	432,736
Grand total.....	43	253,681	79	481,047	122	734,728

Source: U. S. Maritime Commission, Mar. 12, 1947.

Approvals granted, pursuant to secs. 9 and 37 of the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, of the transfer to foreign ownership and/or registry and flag of American-owned vessels for the period commencing July 1, 1946, to and including Jan. 31, 1947

	Total number	Total gross tons
PRIVATELY OWNED VESSELS		
I. Sailing vessels.....	14	3,693
II. Tugs, barges, etc.....	20	4,677
III. Yachts, pleasure craft.....	16	108,430
IV. Tankers.....	38	6,218
V. Commercial vessels under 1,000 gross tons.....	12	74,720
VI. Commercial vessels over 1,000 gross tons:		
(a) By subsidized lines.....	69	297,299
(b) By nonsubsidized lines.....		
Total, July 1, 1946, to Jan. 31, 1947.....	169	495,037
U. S. GOVERNMENT OWNED		
Total number of all types.....	438	12,656,296
Grand total, July 1, 1946, to Jan. 31, 1947.....	607	3,151,333

¹ Of this total 18 were under 1,000 gross tons, 15 of which were sold to UNRRA.

On the same date, February 25, I had a letter from Mr. Philip Murray, president of the CIO, in which he complained that we were not permitting a sufficient number of aliens to work on our ships. On the one hand, they complain about selling the ships for foreign-flag operation by American operators, which he says is being done to avoid the high standard of American wages and safety at sea, and then in the next letter they turn around and complain because we are not permitting sufficient aliens to work on our ships.

The figures show that we have about 17½ percent alien crews on our ships operating today. I shall put in the RECORD the exact figures under permission obtained in the House earlier today. I will also insert in the RECORD a breakdown of the number of these alien sea-

men who are now in the merchant marine. A little while ago they had a delegation down here who went around to the State Department and the Maritime Commission and the Coast Guard and some of the Members of Congress, although they did not come in to see me, with a proposal that we will have before our committee very shortly, in which they asked that we blanket into American citizenship some 14,000 alien seamen who served in the American merchant marine during the war. They propose that they shall be automatically blanketed in. They made the representation that the vast majority of these aliens were Norwegians, Danes, and other Scandinavians. As a matter of fact, a break-down of the figures shows an entirely different story. There are perhaps within this 14,000 not to exceed 1,000 Scandinavians. By far the greater majority of them are men from the Latin-American countries who are National Maritime Union members and are very glad indeed to work under our high scale of wages and are very glad indeed to pay the union dues, which seems to be the principal concern of the unions and seems to be the main reason why they are interested in having these men blanketed into citizenship. They are easier to control.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order that the record may be straight, and in order that the facts may be known to the public and to the unions and to everyone else, I insert in the RECORD at this point several statistical documents—the first of which is a tabulation presented by the Coast Guard giving the complete data of the number of aliens in the unlicensed crews of American registered vessels at sea on March 7, 1947.

TABLE I—Data on aliens in unlicensed areas of American-registered vessels at sea on Mar. 7, 1947

	Number of American-registered vessels at sea	Number of unlicensed personnel aboard such vessels	Number of unlicensed aliens aboard such vessels	Percentage of aliens in unlicensed personnel
Atlantic coast.....	893	32,602	6,695	20.5
Gulf coast.....	291	11,410	1,244	10.9
Pacific coast.....	277	8,887	1,324	14.9
Total.....	1,461	52,899	9,263	17.5

Now, that gives the over-all picture. Next, I submit table 2, likewise prepared from the actual shipping records of the ships at sea on March 7, 1947, furnished by the Coast Guard. At my request they endeavored to give us a spot check on ships then at sea on the Atlantic, the Gulf and the Pacific. In the time available, we could not cover each of these 1,461 ships, but we made a spot check on these three sea lanes taking the exact figures on one passenger ship, one combination passenger and cargo ship, three freighters and three tankers. While the figures speak for themselves as

to nationalities, I call your attention to the fact that the spot check shows an

over-all average of 17.4 percent of aliens in the unlicensed personnel—which jibes

very closely with the 17.5 percent previously referred to:

TABLE II.—Data on aliens according to nationalities in unlicensed crews of 8 American registered vessels (1 passenger, 1 combination passenger and cargo, 3 freighters, and 3 tankers) from each of the three coasts (Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf) at sea on Mar. 7, 1947

Coast	Number of vessels	Number of unlicensed personnel aboard such vessels	Number of aliens in unlicensed personnel of such vessels	Nationalities of unlicensed aliens aboard such vessels													Percentage of aliens in unlicensed personnel
				Mexican, South American, Central American	Philippine Islands	Spanish	British	French	Slavic	Belgian, Dutch	Oriental	Scandinavian	Portuguese	Greek	Polish	Russian	
Atlantic	1. Passenger	345	110	36	13	3	26	4	2	4	11	2	3	1	3	2	31.8
	2. Combination cargo and passenger	37	16	6	2	0	4	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	43.2
	3. Freighter	37	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	1	21.6
	4. Freighter	34	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	0	0	1	1	23.5
	5. Freighter	36	5	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	14.0
	6. Tanker	33	11	3	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	33.3
	7. Tanker	31	6	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	19.4
	8. Tanker	34	4	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.8
	Total	588	168	48	17	6	36	5	4	6	14	15	6	2	4	5	28.8
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crews				8.2	2.9	1.0	6.1	0.9	0.7	1.0	2.4	2.6	1.0	0.3	0.7	0.9	
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crews				28.6	10.1	3.6	21.4	3.0	2.4	3.6	8.3	8.9	3.6	1.2	2.4	3.0	
Gulf	1. Passenger	123	4	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3.3
	2. Combination cargo and passenger	48	9	5	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	18.8
	3. Freighter	29	7	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	24.1
	4. Freighter	30	7	4	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	20.3
	5. Freighter	35	7	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	20.0
	6. Tanker	26	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	8.3
	7. Tanker	27	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3.7
	8. Tanker	22	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11.8
	Total	350	40	17	2	4	7	0	1	2	1	4	1	0	0	1	
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crews				4.9	0.6	1.1	2.0	0	0.3	0.6	0.3	1.1	0.3	0	0	0.3	11.4
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crews				42.5	5.0	10.0	17.5	0	2.5	5.0	2.5	10.0	2.5	0	0	2.5	
Pacific	1. Passenger	324	47	2	24	0	6	0	0	3	6	1	2	2	0	1	14.5
	2. Combination cargo and passenger	74	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2.7
	3. Freighter	29	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	13.8
	4. Freighter	38	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.3
	5. Freighter	38	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2.6
	6. Tanker	35	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5.7
	7. Tanker	39	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2.6
	8. Tanker	31	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.5
	Total	608	61	3	31	0	7	0	0	4	6	2	2	3	1	2	
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crews				0.5	5.1	0	1.2	0	0	0.7	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.3	10.0
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crews				4.9	50.8	0	11.5	0	0	6.6	9.8	3.3	3.3	4.9	1.6	3.3	
Grand total		1,546	209	68	50	10	50	5	5	12	21	21	9	5	5	8	
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crews				4.4	3.2	0.6	3.2	0.3	0.3	0.8	1.4	1.4	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.5	17.4
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crews				25.3	18.6	3.3	18.6	1.9	1.9	4.5	7.8	7.8	3.3	1.9	1.9	3.0	

Now, Mr. Chairman, right at this point, I want to call attention to some figures which were very interesting to me. They refer to the crew lists of the steamship *America*, the safest ship afloat and the flagship of our passenger-carrying merchant marine, and the steamship *Washington*. In submitting these figures I should give the membership a little of the background. These are, perhaps, our two best passenger-carrying ships with which we are attempting to capture the postwar travel of the citizens of this Nation and the entire world.

When we put the steamship *America* back into service, we went to considerable pains to hand-pick her crew. Mr. Curran of the National Maritime Union and Admiral Smith of the Maritime Commission cooperated in hand-picking

this crew and in bringing them to the war-famous Sheepshead Bay Training Center, just outside of New York, where they were especially trained and indoctrinated into how to serve the worldwide traveling public so that that same international public could be made to realize we were really making a bid for supremacy on the high seas as far as passenger vessels were concerned. The steamship *Washington* is, perhaps, our second best bid for this world supremacy.

It is interesting to note the fact that while we spent many many thousands of dollars training these special crews, under the rotary hiring system followed by the unions today many of the original members of these crews have since gotten off those ships and as the figures show have been supplanted by an ever-increasing number of aliens. It is an

ominous trend I do not like and, frankly, I don't believe the union leadership likes it either. I know the operators of the steamships themselves do not like it.

Mr. Chairman, as I told Mr. Murray, as chairman of this Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I stand foursquare for an American merchant marine second to none in this world, manned by American citizens, and I believe my splendid committee stands back of me foursquare; and if there is anyone who doubts that or questions the stand our committee has taken, we will be very glad to give them a thoroughly aired hearing at any time.

I have expressed my thorough disapproval of this entire program in no uncertain terms, which you will find in the *RECORD* and which I shall not repeat.

TABLE III.—Data on aliens according to nationalities for voyages No. 1 and No. 6 of the S. S. "America" and voyages No. 11 and No. 13 of the S. S. "Washington"

Vessels	Number of unlicensed personnel on board	Number of aliens in unlicensed personnel on board	Nationalities of unlicensed aliens on board														Percentage of aliens in unlicensed personnel.	
			Mexican, Central American, South American	Philippine Islands	Spanish	British	French	Slavic	Belgian, Dutch	Oriental	Scandinavian	Portuguese	Greek	Polish	Russian	Austrian		Italian
S. S. America:																		
Voyage No. 1, commencing on Nov. 27, 1946	698	98	14	9	0	27	4	10	10	9	7	2	0	1	0	1	4	-----
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crew			2.0	1.3	0	3.9	0.6	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.0	0.3	0	0.1	0	0.1	0.6	14.0
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crew			14.3	9.2	0	27.6	4.1	10.2	10.2	9.2	7.1	2.0	0	1.0	0	1.0	4.1	-----
Voyage No. 6, commencing on Feb. 21, 1947	663	129	18	8	7	40	5	15	7	12	3	2	1	3	2	1	5	-----
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crew			2.7	1.2	1.1	6.0	0.8	2.3	1.1	1.8	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.8	19.5
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crew			14.0	6.2	5.4	31.0	3.9	11.6	5.4	9.3	2.3	1.6	0.8	2.3	1.6	0.8	3.9	-----
S. S. Washington:																		
Voyage No. 11, commencing on Nov. 27, 1946	442	109	15	14	3	29	4	11	4	11	4	3	2	3	1	3	0	-----
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crew			3.4	3.2	0.7	6.6	0.9	2.5	0.9	2.5	0.9	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.2	0.7	0	24.7
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crew			13.8	12.8	2.8	26.6	3.7	10.0	3.7	10.0	3.7	2.8	1.8	2.8	0.9	2.8	0	-----
Voyage No. 13, commencing on Feb. 10, 1947	346	110	36	13	3	26	4	2	4	11	2	3	1	3	2	0	0	-----
Percentage of aliens based on entire unlicensed crew			10.4	3.8	0.9	7.5	1.2	0.6	1.2	3.2	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.6	0	0	31.8
Percentage of aliens based on total number of aliens in unlicensed crew			32.7	11.8	2.7	23.6	3.6	1.8	3.6	10.0	1.8	2.7	0.9	2.7	1.8	0	0	-----

Now, Mr. Chairman, this matter of aliens was called to my attention after the subcommittee had reported the bill. I did not know what trick the union had up its sleeve. But when the bill is read for amendment I intend to offer an amendment which will instruct the Commandant of the Coast Guard that he shall not issue waiver on any aliens except for employment in the steward's department. I have talked it over with Commodore Sheppard of the Coast Guard and Admiral Smith of the Maritime Commission and the operators and they are all in accord. Personally, I would like to insist that no waivers be granted on account of aliens anywhere on our ships, but they tell me there is a distinct shortage of qualified seamen in the steward's department and they feel for the time being they will have to ask that some waiver be granted in the steward's department. I will put some more interesting information in the RECORD, but this is another case of where we do not like the bill; we are sorry for the necessity of it, but if we are going to move these people we simply have to pass this bill and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, the arguments for the passage of this bill are exactly similar to and of equal force with the arguments advanced in behalf of H. R. 1240. The persons who will be carried on board the ships involved in this joint resolution are mainly of a different character and engaged in different pursuits, but the situation with respect to the ships themselves and with respect to the necessity for performing the work that the ships are engaged in, is exactly on a par with the necessities discussed in connection with the bill just passed by the House.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to elaborate any further on this

measure or take up any more of the time of the committee.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the pending resolution covers the protection of American citizens transported on ships flying the flag of the United States. While there have been international conventions with reference to safety at sea and the United States has been a signatory, yet the so-called international standards of safety at sea have not been thought sufficient to protect the lives of American citizens. After the happening of each catastrophe at sea the Congress of the United States enacted laws for greater protection of American life at sea, and these protective measures have been enacted from time to time by Congress and are now enforced by the Coast Guard and set forth in the volume known as Laws Governing Marine Inspection. The purpose of this resolution is to place in the hands of the Coast Guard and give it absolute discretion to suspend the operation of every law built up by experience for the protection of American citizens riding on American-flag ships. The resolution does not provide for the suspension of a few, but it authorizes suspension of every last one, and misleads every person boarding an American-flag ship into the belief that he is riding on a ship complying with the laws of safety as enacted by the Congress of the United States, because the Coast Guard gives it sanction to sail. I do not believe that American citizens should be misled into believing they are riding on safe ships when it is absolutely the opposite. I do not believe that the Congress should so deal lightly with human life at sea, especially when these laws have been built up after years of experience and after each catastrophe at sea costing the lives of hundreds of American citizens. The excuse given in the request for the suspension of laws of safety at sea is that

the War Powers Act might not be extended; that ships of other nations have lower standards and they had them when these safety laws were enacted; that Americans will ride on foreign ships; and that this country is going to take on a program of moving approximately 1,000,000 misplaced persons around the world on American-flag ships. I do not feel that these reasons are sufficient to ask the Congress to suspend laws enacted for the protection of human life at sea. Is the mere fact that foreign flags operate passenger ships with lower standards of safety than ours, that American citizens will ride on foreign ships—should that be a sufficient excuse to suspend the law of safety at sea and secretly expose without their knowledge the lives of American citizens riding on American-flag ships stamped with the approval of the Coast Guard? If civilians with full knowledge of the risks involved desire to ride on ships that do not come up to the laws of safety of the United States, it might be their privilege. However, I believe that the least that can be done with reference to civilians who have the free choice of riding is that they be informed that the ship does not comply with the laws of safety at sea. At the time of the reading of the bill I should like to offer an amendment for your consideration which might be of material assistance in saving lives of American people.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. I yield.

Mr. HART. The gentleman knows this bill is limited in its effect to April 1, 1948.

Mr. WEICHEL. Yes; it is limited to a definite period of time.

Mr. HART. In the course of his remarks the gentleman stated that there were 1,000,000 displaced persons to be transported in American ships. The gentleman does not mean to imply does he, that those million displaced persons are to be transported on ships during

the life of this bill if it is enacted into law?

Mr. WEICHEL. Most probably not. That was the suggestion at the hearings, that there might be that many displaced persons. They could not be moved in that period of time, obviously.

Mr. HART. As a matter of fact I believe that the gentleman will find that the number of displaced persons disclosed by the hearings was 800,000.

Mr. WEICHEL. I was looking at the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

Then I yield the remainder of what time has been allotted to me to the distinguished gentleman from California, chairman of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request that the gentleman from Massachusetts may speak out of order?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, we have blithely granted a loan of \$3,750,000,000 to Great Britain. But even the extreme optimists do not expect that it will ever be paid back in full. We are becoming trained to astronomical appropriations and a skyrocketing debt.

In the process, we find some strange and baffling contradictions, which seem to put our financial policy in the same class as those mysteries above human understanding.

I have just mentioned the loan to Britain, which our friends across the water may justly regard as being "pound foolish." By way of contrast, I want to mention a smaller item, which has come to my attention.

Under the immigration quota system, it appears that 17,000 Irish men and women are entitled to leave their homeland and settle in the United States—17,000 each year. Now this is a small quota, compared with that allotted to some other countries. However, having established the quota, the understanding is that our Government shall do everything in its power to cut red tape and quickly process applications, so that those who qualify, may come to this country as soon as possible.

This is the theory but not the practice.

In fact, we are defaulting on our obligations to these future citizens.

Eight thousand Irish men and women—less than half the quota—have applied for immigration visas to the United States. But these visas, to which they are entitled, are not being granted because the American consulate general in Dublin claims that his staff is too small to handle the job.

Our consulate in Ireland, now processes only 100 visas monthly, or 25 a week. By right, if 17,000 Irishmen applied for entry to the United States in 1946, they should be permitted to enter the country in 1946. At the present rate of processing, it will take 7 years for half the 1946 quota to be cleared.

This is what I mean by calling our appropriations for the consular service "penny wise" and niggardly, cheapening

us in the eyes of prospective citizens who rely upon our good faith. They have complied with their obligations in the matter, but we are failing in ours.

There is much resentment in the United States as well as Ireland over this inexcusable delay in granting visas to Irish emigrants. Many Senators and Congressmen have had the exasperating experience of trying to get action on these legitimate applications, only to be told that it is impossible so long as the consulate is inadequately staffed.

The consular service is not a war-time or emergency function of Government. It is a fundamental. But it seems that we have neglected fundamentals in our preoccupation with experiments.

Perhaps it is time to pay some attention to the prosaic obligations of Government.

With this in mind, I suggest that we make a modest financial appropriation that will enable our consular service to do the job for which it was intended. If we can lend—and I use the word advisedly—if we can lend billions to other nations, surely we can appropriate a few thousands to bring our own foreign service up to that degree of respectability where it will not have to make excuses for its shortcomings.

This "penny-wise" policy for our consulates and legations, is doing us a great disservice.

It should be remedied without delay.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, we have just acted upon a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to waive certain requirements of vessel inspection laws insofar as ships operated by the War Department are concerned.

House Joint Resolution 76 now under consideration covers the same general waivers for vessels operated by private interests, whether owned either by such interests or by the United States Maritime Commission.

Title 5 of the Second War Powers Act provided that—

The head of each Department or agency responsible for the administration of the navigation and vessel inspection laws . . . is authorized to waive compliance with such laws to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as he may prescribe either upon his own initiative or upon the written recommendation of the head of any other Government agency, whenever he deems that such action is necessary for the conduct of the war.

As this title of the Second War Powers Act expires on March 31, 1947, all such vessels on which waivers are now being granted must be withdrawn from service on that date unless an extension of waivers is authorized and it is the purpose of this House joint resolution to bring about such authorization.

Prior to the war passenger ships under the United States flag were operating under safety regulations set up by the Congress, which regulations are more stringent than the rules of the International Convention for Safety at Sea, to which this Nation subscribes. Ships then under the American flag were taken over by the Government and largely modified to make them suitable for wartime service. In such service refinements for safety must be discarded in the pursuit

of the greater aim of the transportation of troops and matériel required for the successful conduct of the war. As a result, ships which in prewar days complied with the requirements of our vessel inspection laws no longer meet these requirements and will not conform until considerable reconversions have been accomplished. It may be noted at this point that many of these ships were lost during the war, so that at the present time, even though the reconversions mentioned above were completed, the shipping facilities of the Nation would still be inadequate for the transportation of passengers in prewar passenger-carrying vessels.

A large number of vessels were built during the war, and many of these were fitted as personnel carriers. No efforts were made to bring these ships into compliance with normal vessel inspection laws, as such compliance would unfit them for their primary purpose of assisting in the exertion of our maximum efforts to achieve quick and complete victory. These ships carried great numbers of personnel during war years and since the cessation of hostilities and have had an enviable safety record.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, like other members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I voted to report this bill and am supporting it because there is nothing else we can do. The hearings disclosed that if waivers were not continued at this time, the flag of the United States Merchant Marine would have to be hauled down or at least flown at half mast. Nevertheless, some of us on the committee act in this matter with great reluctance. To me this necessity of waiving safety requirements, more than a year and a half after VJ-day, is a sharp warning of the difficulties we face in maintaining our merchant marine in a healthy, leading position on the high seas.

Frankly, I am not so concerned with the gravity of present dangers to travelers. The persons carried by our ships will be infinitely safer than those who were transported during the shooting period of the war. And our record during those years was remarkable in the small loss of life, except for that resulting from enemy action.

What I think is ominous is that there appears to be no end in sight for the need of such waivers and of the taking of such calculated risks in the months to come.

The recent fire in New York Harbor on the one-time luxury cruise ship *Kungsholm*, now the *John Ericsson*, is a timely reminder of the ever-present fire hazard. About the same time 150 lives were lost from an 800-ton overcrowded steamer on the Yangtze River. Danger is ever present on shipboard. The radio this morning reported that one of our freighters struck a mine in the Mediterranean.

If we are to maintain the prestige of the American merchant marine, we must raise rather than lower our standards.

We cannot have a "big league" fleet that is only first class when it comes to carrying freight. We must have passenger ships of high quality as well—ships that may become great troop carriers, if the need arises. But at present this passenger fleet is not in sight in adequate strength and it will not grow as long as we use makeshifts without some dead line toward which we can look with confidence as the time when we will have ample modern and safe passenger service under our flag, with which to meet our commitments.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economy-minded Congress. I am deeply glad that it is. I have little fear that we will carry economy to the point of directly hampering our armed services. We have learned our lesson in that field by now, I trust. But we must remember that the Army and Navy must be supplemented by a powerful merchant marine if we are to have real preparedness. That means that our shipbuilding industry must be kept active, that new and modern vessels must be laid down and large sums allocated for such a program. We must not look forward to seeing our merchant marine pass through a period of being forced to use obsolescent or improvised material as did our Army in the late thirties and in 1940, when broomsticks were labeled machine guns and ice trucks used to simulate tanks. In those days there was little consolation for those of us behind the wooden guns in the fact that modern equipment was on order. Today we are using freighters for passenger ships. It begins to parallel our old sad story of unpreparedness.

I urge upon this body that we must make our savings in other fields wherever we can, but we cannot afford to do with makeshifts in our merchant marine.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, after repeated statements by the President of the United States that this country desires the admission to Palestine of the Hebrew refugees now in the displaced persons camps in the western zones in Europe, and after resolutions by innumerable American organizations, both major political parties, and editorials in most newspapers to the same effect, a group of American citizens have been arrested by the British for trying to do their part in implementing that American policy.

Eighteen American seamen, members of the crew of the refugee ship *Ben Hecht*, are now in a Palestinian jail after having been seized last week end. The ship, American property, owned by the Tyre Shipping Co., of New York, has also been seized. It had been under charter from the Tyre Shipping Co. to the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation which conducts repatriation activities via the underground railway from Europe to Palestine.

The crew, consisting of both Jewish and non-Jewish American volunteers, is charged under local legislation with "abetting persons illegally" to immigrate to Palestine. The American League for a Free Palestine, which raised the funds

with which the ship was purchased, has contended that there has been no violation of either American or international law—except by the British in their blockade of the Palestine coast. Prof. Fowler Harper, on the faculty of Yale University Law School, said 2 days ago that—

This will be a test case in the sense that a British court will decide whether Mr. Bevin's foreign policy or international law is paramount.

The fact that the British have delayed releasing or trying the crew members for another 2 weeks pending investigation strongly indicates that they, too, are aware of the critical test nature of the case.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the Tyre Shipping Co. has engaged a Haifa attorney, Mr. Joseph Kaiserman, to protect its interest in the ship and to defend the crew, which includes two Norwegian volunteer seamen. I understand, further, that both the American Department of State and the proper Norwegian authorities have been approached by representatives of the Tyre Shipping Co. regarding the safeguarding of the rights of the crew members and the protection of their interest.

Inasmuch as the rights and freedom of American citizens are now at stake and threatened by regulations which, at best, are of doubtful validity in a confused and contested situation, inasmuch as stated and confirmed American policy regarding an area which belongs to the international community, not to the British, is in direct opposition to the incumbent administration in Palestine on the issue of Hebrew entry, and inasmuch as American men manned the *Ben Hecht* under the impression—hardly to be disputed—that it was in furtherance of American interest and policy as stated by President Truman, as well as a daring and humane venture, I strongly urge that the Government of the United States spare no effort to protect the young seamen and to secure their immediate release. I hope that the Department of State has already thrown its resources behind them and that it will succeed in freeing the men, in securing the return of the ship to its owners, and in supporting a precedent of American action on this issue which, if followed, may well bring about a quick solution to the entire problem.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POTTS].

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been hearing testimony on this and the previous bill for a long period of time, and the volumes which have been built up are truly considerable. We were worried about this whole problem just as we knew that the Members of Congress would be worried about it here on the floor, and I think that the problem is very easy of statement. It is: Are we going to drive the American merchant marine from the high seas at a time when the people who ride in American ships can get no better accommodations and no better ships from any nation in the world today? We can prevent our ships from plying the high seas, yes, we can do

that, but the *Queen Mary*, which could not meet our standards, could still come in here, and the *Queen Elizabeth* could still come in here, and the ships of all the other nations of the world could come in here and bring these people, and the merchant marine would suffer an irreparable loss. That is the situation.

I think we all appreciate the great service which the Coast Guard has done for American shipping. They do not grant waivers lightly. While these ships cannot meet full American requirements, they are equally as good as the ships of these other nations that will be plying the high seas, and we know that when the Commandant of the Coast Guard gives a waiver he has assured himself that the ship is a pretty good one and reasonably well constructed to make the crossing.

In every situation, of course, there is an element of risk, but that is a calculated risk. I think the fact that American shipping has progressed to the extent it has, with the small loss of ships and lives, is due to the fact that we have a grand merchant marine. The men who man our ships are thoroughly capable. While these ships may not be up to the standard fixed by statute they are good ships, and with the men who man our ships they are reasonably safe. I think that is the problem we have before us. While we would like the American merchant marine to be superior to any other in the world, we must remember they are not the least bit worse than the ships of the other countries which now can enter our harbors.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, the waivers which this act are intended to cover will apply to the two classifications mentioned above, that is, former passenger ships converted to war purposes and which have not yet been reconstructed for peacetime service, and to war-built vessels, most of which were never intended for passenger service in normal times, and none of which can now comply with vessel inspection laws.

In general, former passenger-carrying vessels are being restored to compliance with vessel inspection laws and they will, by the end of this year, be in conformance thereto. With minor exceptions only, we have little to worry about concerning these ships, but only a very few of them are now in service, the rest being in shipyards undergoing reconversion. The ships which we must keep in operation, if we are to continue necessary passenger movements, are these war-built vessels which lack practically every vestige of comfort, or sign of suitable accommodation which we have been accustomed to expect in maritime service. Practically all of these ships are reasonably fire resistant. As they are war-built ships their interior arrangements are almost uniformly of steel, and as such, offer little fire hazard. It is true that they do not have the fire-resistant bulkheads which our laws require, neither do they have sprinkler systems, fire-detecting systems, or remote control for water-tight doors. However, the need for all of these things can be greatly

mitigated by proper watches and careful supervision, and I do not consider the lack of them to be such that we should bar these vessels from carrying passengers on the sea under the present circumstances.

A reasonable number of vertical transverse bulkheads are provided and where these bulkheads are pierced by doors, such doors are normally closed before leaving port and are kept closed at sea.

In general, life-saving arrangements are inadequate because of the fact that such boats and davits as are provided were designed and installed primarily for the landing of troops either in harbors, or in reasonably sheltered locations during attacks on the beaches of our recent enemies. On this account some of these ships have lifeboats which normally require power for lifting them before they are launched and this makes them undesirable and unsatisfactory for marine disaster at sea on account of the possibility of the loss of the power supply on board ship. However, hand gear is provided for such contingencies, but it is slow and might be rather ineffective. Ample life rafts and life preservers are provided in all cases, but I am of the opinion, that the number of passengers on board should, at all times, be kept down to lifeboat capacity and that life rafts and other buoyant gear should not be included in the count of adequate life-saving facilities for these vessels, while in passenger service, and I have so informed operators on every occasion.

Right here let me mention that we now have one first-class liner, the *America*, operating in the North Atlantic without waiver and that we have one or two other American vessels also operating in southern waters. These are admirable ships with superstandards of safety and none of the comments in these remarks apply in any way to them. I wish to make it clear also that the remarks following apply only to a number of war-built vessels which are carrying passengers on an emergency basis and possibly to some of the older ships which have not yet been reconverted.

I have inspected various ships just recently and I consider that the normal passenger accommodations now being furnished on these war-built vessels are a disgrace to the American flag and to this great Nation which owns these vessels. Except in this emergency, when transportation seems to be essential even under the most unfortunate conditions, I cannot conceive of the carrying of women and children in such accommodations, and under such atrociously uncomfortable conditions, as we are now doing. It seems to me, while recognizing the necessities of the present condition, that this Government should make every possible effort to provide, as soon as possible, a number of respectable ships for passenger-carrying service in the North Atlantic so as to put an end to the conditions which now exist.

From an examination of these ships, I believe that they are carrying far more passengers than are justified, both in view of their life-saving facilities and of their living accommodations, and I think that the number should be reduced sharply even though it may be necessary

to put more ships into service, or to reduce the number of passengers carried. Let us remember that, in general, these ships are owned by the Government and that they are operated by private interests under general agency agreements. I realize that reducing the number of passengers allowed on each of such ships will materially reduce the profits accruing from each voyage, but I do not believe this Government should continue to make money from the misery, inconvenience, and lack of safety which ocean travelers must now encounter and which could be somewhat mitigated by reducing the number of people on board each ship.

In adopting this resolution your subcommittee, which has considered it, believes that it has taken the logical and correct course in placing the responsibility for the granting of waivers directly upon the authority responsible for the enforcement of vessel-inspection laws of the United States, that is, the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard. It is to be noted also that the wording of the resolution no longer directs that the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall grant waivers, but that it authorizes him to do so. As the United States Coast Guard maintains an office of Merchant Marine Safety under the direction of a chief of many years' experience, there is not the slightest reason to assume that any waivers will be granted unless they are deemed justifiable under current conditions and well within the limits of the calculated risk involved.

Right here I should like to inject the remark that quite to the contrary of public opinion, the position of the United States in the passenger-carrying traffic in the North Atlantic is pitiful indeed, and that if we are not to see ourselves almost entirely displaced from that great maritime service in which we have been an outstanding participant so many years, we must take some action without delay to strengthen our position. It would appear now that unless some such action is taken it will be only a reasonably few months before the American flag will be carried upon only one passenger ship across the lanes of the North Atlantic, and even this ship, the *America*, can no longer claim to be the latest and the best in naval architecture. It is my intent, within a few days, to introduce legislation to authorize and direct the Maritime Commission to construct, or cause to be constructed, two ships for service in this North Atlantic trade—two ships which will be the equal of anything now afloat or under construction.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress may become sufficiently aware of the disastrous situation which must soon confront us in the North Atlantic so that legislation may be adopted to put American superliners into the North Atlantic trade.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation must be enacted by Congress if the passenger-carrying segment of the American merchant marine is to survive the crisis which now confronts it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That effective April 1, 1947, the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, is authorized and directed to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard to the extent and in such manner and upon such terms as may be deemed necessary by him in the conduct of the war or the orderly reconversion of the merchant marine from wartime to peacetime operations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "and directed."
Page 1, line 8, after the word "in" strike out "the conduct of the war."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 2. The authority granted by this resolution shall remain in force only until January 1, 1948.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "January 1, 1948" and insert "April 1, 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan: On page 2, line 2, after the words "April 1, 1948," strike out the period and insert "Provided, That after June 1, 1947, the Commandant shall not waive compliance with those sections of the navigation and vessel inspection laws requiring employment of American citizens as officers and crew members, and limiting the employment of aliens except insofar as such employment shall be in the steward's department of vessels authorized to carry in excess of 12 passengers."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use all the time. This is the amendment to which I referred earlier in my remarks on this bill. I may say for the information of the House that the words "12 passengers" are put in the amendment because a ship is not a passenger ship, in the eyes of the regulations, until it carries more than 12 passengers. We have a certain number of cargo vessels that are designed to carry 12 passengers or less and they are not regarded as passenger ships.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. Will that be enough seamen to serve on the American ships?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I understand there are plenty of seamen. There are many of them on the beach today—good loyal American citizens—who are being forced out of our merchant marine by the continued employment of all these aliens. They make life so miserable for them on board ship that they cannot serve with them.

Mr. BLAND. I would be in sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman if assured that the facts justified the amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I believe the principal difficulty is in the steward's department only.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HART. I feel somewhat the same as the distinguished former chairman of the committee [Mr. BLAND]. I feel that I do not have enough information with respect to the gentleman's amendment to vote intelligently upon it. The gentleman himself has stated he has had the benefit of conversations with labor leaders and officials of the Government, but I have had none and as far as I know, most of the members of the committee have had none. I would much prefer to act upon an amendment of this nature, if it were desirable at all, after the information and facts had been submitted to the committee for further consideration.

I shall not oppose the amendment but I do think that the offering of it at this time and under these circumstances is at least a bit ill-advised.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I have had the matter up with the unions, with the operators, with the Coast Guard officials, and with the Maritime officials. They are all in favor of it. The big hazard that the Coast Guard fears in the continued employment of a large quantity of aliens, especially on the deck, is due to the fact that a lot of those men, despite the law, do not speak the English language, and in the event of a calamity, where it is necessary to launch and use lifeboats, the officers or crew who do not speak their language, cannot control those men. That is the greatest hazard, and the Coast Guard is very much concerned about it.

I am sorry I did not have this alien matter called to my attention when the bill was before the committee, but it was called to my attention afterward.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 2, after the words "January 1, 1948", insert:

"SEC. 3. All passengers shall be notified in writing prior to embarkation of all waivers of the navigation and vessel-inspection laws which have been granted for the vessel on which they are about to sail."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have discussed here this afternoon the great need for waivers. Everyone seems to have been taken into consideration, except the American citizen who is about to ride overseas. There is no provision in this resolution whereby the American citizen before he boards the ship shall be informed what risk he is taking. I do not understand why it should be a secret, why the Coast Guard should not inform the prospective passenger that he is about to ride on a ship that is not safe according to the laws enacted by the Congress. There seems to be some idea that the prospective passenger should not know that there is a waiver on the ship. There seems to be some idea that he should not be informed and some idea that if the Coast Guard permits a

ship to sail and waives the safety laws, the prospective passenger should not know that fact.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEICHEL. If the gentleman will permit me to continue for a minute, then I shall be glad to yield.

I see no reason why, if the Congress wants to authorize the Coast Guard to waive safety laws, there should be objection to informing prospective passengers so that they may make their own choice as to whether or not they want to ride on such a ship. This amendment gives the passenger the knowledge on which he can make a choice as to whether he wants to risk his life or not.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman include in his amendment that the passenger shall also be furnished with a statement that he cannot get on any ship anywhere in the world, under any flag, that will be as safe as a ship that flies the American flag?

Mr. WEICHEL. They could give them that as additional information and if they still want to take the risk then it is all right; but I think they should be informed.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this case is very much the same as going to the doctor. It is a highly technical affair. There is not 1 person in 10,000 who would have the slightest idea about what most of these waivers were.

We have a perfectly competent Coast Guard to take care of it. We have set up in the Coast Guard a division of maritime safety. Their work is to look out for the safety of the American people. We have officers in that service who have devoted their lifetime to that kind of work. They are looking out for the safety of the American people and will not issue waivers beyond what they feel must be taken as a calculated risk.

When you go to a doctor and he prescribes for you it is on what he knows about your condition. When you buy a ticket on a ship on which a waiver has been granted, there is exactly the same condition.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. You have exactly the same thing in everyday life in connection with building safety codes where waivers have to be issued. There are any number of apartment houses, hotels, and office buildings right here in Washington today that do not meet our safety standards and fire-inspection requirements, yet they are given waivers.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield.

Mr. HART. As a matter of fact, there was testimony before the committee that in practically all cases the Coast Guard does now so advise prospective passen-

gers that the ship does not measure up to all the safety standards.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. May I advise the gentleman from New Jersey that the Coast Guard does not. The passengers buy their tickets in all parts of the United States at ticket offices of these various steamship agencies, and the passengers have no knowledge other than that the ship has been passed or allowed to sail by our Inspection Service.

Mr. HART. There was some testimony from some official before our committee—I cannot recall just now who it was, to the effect that prior to the departure of these ships the passengers were advised that they did not come up to the standards.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. My recollection is that the thought was it could be done. I agree it could be done.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POTTS. My recollection from the hearings is that waivers were asked only on ships carrying displaced persons who were being moved by the Government; that in those cases the displaced persons were required to sign a waiver which absolved the Government of all responsibility if they chose to accept the accommodations offered and be brought to another country.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I do not recall that that is in effect.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. May I ask the gentleman, who is an old sea captain: Would it not defeat the very idea of safety if passengers were put aboard a ship loaded down with the doctrine that something was wrong with it? Might it not make it harder for the ship's officers to handle them if there were an emergency at sea?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Personally, I think it would be very poor policy and very poor judgment to get these passengers up before you and tell them that one of the watertight doors in the ship did not have the proper remote control or, possibly, that the smoke indicator in hold C-4 or C-5 was not in order. Most of the waivers are relatively small. The larger ones, I think, are essential. As I said, I do not believe the passenger would know what they are anyway, I do not think it would do them any good, and the amendment, if adopted, would cause nothing but confusion and bring not one iota of safety to anybody.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WEICHEL. Does not the gentleman think the passenger should make the choice as to whether he rides or wants to ride?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I do not. I do not think he is competent to make it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The passenger would have to ride on the vessel if he rode at all, would he not?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Only military passengers have to ride and that is covered by the previous bill, may I say to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, we who serve on the Appropriations Committee are continuously running into conditions that, on the face of them, appear to call for legislation. Appropriations, of course, is not a policy or legislative committee. It is for that reason that I desire to bring to your attention and to the attention of the Members of this body a matter which I believe necessitates our taking corrective action. A saving in money, morale, and materials would appear to be a possibility. Those three "m's" are important in peace as well as in war.

Last week the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia held hearings for the justification of a supplemental appropriation involving a request by the Board of Public Welfare for the District of Columbia government.

Now, there can be no doubt that the matter of providing funds for the assistance and rehabilitation of certain bodies of our citizens, who, because of many circumstances often beyond their individual control, must look to some form of public or private assistance as rightly the concern of government. Several years ago this proper function of government was recognized, and this House, in cooperation with our colleagues in the Senate, and with the able counsel of several Federal agencies and many private relief and welfare organizations throughout the Nation, devised legislation that would meet an insistent need to provide for the security and well-being of our needy and worthy citizens.

Largely this legislation was effected through the Social Security Act of 1935. I believe I reflect the wisdom of this present Congress when I say that the efficiency and soundness of the intent and principle behind this legislation has proved itself during these subsequent years.

I want to call to your attention, Mr. Chairman, facts developed in the hearings to which I have already referred, which, while dealing with a purely local and District matter, are basically reflective of a situation national in its scope.

Prior to 1932 there was no such thing in the District of Columbia as appropriations for public welfare. Up to that time, those who were in need of total subsistence, or those needing subsistence allowances to augment limited personal earnings, were dependent upon private charitable and welfare organizations.

In June of the depression year of 1932, when there was widespread local unem-

ployment, Congress appropriated \$350,000 for "emergency relief of residents of the District of Columbia" and subsequently two additional appropriations totaling \$1,150,000 in the fiscal year 1933 were granted.

Since that time, public relief in varying amounts, has become a fixed item in the District bill. For the coming fiscal year the request is based on an estimated need of \$646,000 carried under the title in the appropriation bill as "General public assistance."

In the District of Columbia welfare program, general public assistance receives no Federal matching fund. However, two other forms of public assistance resulted from national legislation for grants-in-aid, dependent for their administration upon augmenting Federal funds. One is for old-age assistance, amounting to \$513,000 a year; the other for aid to the blind at \$53,000—these sums from District of Columbia revenues, I repeat, being matched by Federal allotments.

In addition, the District's share of grants for dependent children increased from \$225,000 in 1933 to \$607,000 estimated for next year. These sums of money, Mr. Chairman, you will recognize as sizable items in the District of Columbia total budget of approximately \$90,000,000. All of these items, Mr. Chairman, are being granted today without specific legislation, either authorizing them or setting up proper administrative methods, and this situation obtains throughout the Nation.

I believe you will agree with me that the operation has been tested for enough years to warrant proper corrective legislation at this time. And as we deal with the aspect of what shall be the proper legislation, we come to the matter that is of national, as well as local, concern.

Mr. Chairman, we took the first great step forward in the early 30's when we saw to it that the Federal Government accepted a responsibility for maintaining those who were down-and-out by granting financial assistance. So far, however, we have failed to consider the second great step—the rehabilitation of those individuals involved in relief and welfare programs so that in the quickest possible time they could be taken off the relief rolls and returned to productive useful life.

It appears to me to be the appropriate time for Congress to consider carefully whether a system of monthly payments, given to unemployable indigents in our many communities through the Nation, and designed originally to alleviate distress in an emergency, is to become a regular function of Government in good times as well as in bad.

Operating as it has in these last years of large-employment opportunity, and unusual earning capacity as well, the system has created a way of life for that class of people who readily and easily go on relief and depend entirely for subsistence on monthly checks from some public fund. Flagrant and sensational cases of abuse have come to our attention.

Now, we have no particular quarrel with this system insofar as it represents

the effort of Government to provide relief as an emergency measure for those who must have relief in several forms. We do, however, have serious question whether the system provides more at present than simply a permanent way of life. Here in the District and throughout the Nation there is a demand for civic improvements, progress programs, and so forth. The cost of these comes necessarily from the same budget as relief. Obviously ways to end as well as serve relief are needed.

The time has come for us to accept this second responsibility and devise the means of meeting it. A public clamor has been raised across the Nation concerning certain abuses in our welfare systems. There is a demand that this Congress review the provisions of the social security law so that relief cannot for any person become simply a way of life.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that the most essential fact in this regard, made evident by the situation existing in the District of Columbia, is that the problem of rehabilitation is one that must be met locally in each community, and that we must give to our welfare administrators on that local level the means and the authority to undertake their task with a much wider degree of flexibility than now granted them under the provisions of the Social Security Act.

We cannot simply make a grant of funds from the Federal Treasury or from any other public treasury and then take no heed of what becomes of those moneys. Neither can we any longer allow set rules to be made by local officials, administering Federal funds, when these rules are not flexible enough to meet the judgment of workers handling individual cases.

This is not alone the job for the subcommittee on District of Columbia appropriations. Yet it often seems that, in addition to the seven very able members on that committee, all too few in the District are actively concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of Congress cannot bring individuals back to self-respect by merely passing laws; but trained workers operating on the local levels can undertake this task. Federal welfare, I believe, may profitably be compared to fire engines: Fire engines by their very nature must not be used on frivolous occasions but they must be ready to meet any sort of emergency upon a minute's notice. But we must, as citizens, beware of false alarms in the extension of relief aid. Immediate dismissal should be the fate of any welfare worker who falsely or unnecessarily extended aid.

Moreover, it is paramount that we concentrate on fire-prevention programs to make the use of fire engines almost negligible. Simple and perfunctory cooperation with the assessor's office, with the penal institutions, and with employment agencies of all types should prove vastly corrective of abuses. By the same token that welfare programs are essential in our community, they, too, must be ready for every emergency but must never be abused.

Mr. Chairman, I urgently ask that the Members of this Congress acquaint themselves with the facts as they exist in their own communities and on the basis of that information consider ways of plugging the loopholes in our present national social security laws—of broadening local control in the administration of these laws—and, most important, effecting programs that will make the rehabilitation of persons the criterion of all our efforts.

To further show the interest in this matter I ask permission to include at this point an editorial from the March 11 Washington Evening Star and from the March 12 Washington Post.

I should comment, however, that both the work and the information before the subcommittee was by no means superficial as indicated by the Post editorial.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 11, 1947]

TIME TO REVIEW THE SYSTEM

Chairman HORAN, of the House Subcommittee on District Appropriations, has pointed out some incidents of waste in public relief which he attributes to the system rather than to inefficiency of individuals. He wants the leaks plugged. He is constructive in his criticism, the relief authorities agree with much of what he says, and something may be done about it.

But the broader question relates to where we are going with a public-assistance program, relatively new as a function of Government, which has never received legislative authorization beyond the allotment of funds in appropriation bills. The sums spent each year on public relief are substantial items in the District budget. It is time that the whole system be subjected to careful study by the District legislative committees and that we cease depending on annual improvisation through appropriation bills.

Prior to 1932 there was no such thing in the District as appropriations for "public relief." Up to that time families in distress were the wards of private charitable and welfare organizations. In June of the depression year of 1932, when there was widespread local unemployment, Congress appropriated \$350,000 for "emergency relief of residents," following it up with two deficiency appropriations which made a total of \$1,150,000 in the fiscal year 1933. The money, known as general public assistance, goes to those considered unemployable. It has become an annual charge, a fixture in the District bill. For the next fiscal year the estimate is \$646,000.

In the meantime, two other forms of public assistance resulted from national legislation for grants-in-aid. One is for old-age assistance, amounting to about \$513,000 a year, the other for aid to the blind, \$53,000, these sums from local revenue matching Federal allotments. In addition, the District's share of grants for dependent children has increased from \$225,000, in 1933, to \$607,000 estimated for next year.

The first category—general public assistance—is paid entirely from local revenues, with no help from Federal funds. It is the largest expenditure and there has never been specific legislation authorizing it or setting up administrative methods. Everything has been done through appropriation bills. Legislation is advisable for two reasons.

First, there should be careful consideration whether a system of monthly payments to unemployable indigents, designed originally to alleviate distress in an emergency, is to become a regular function of Government in good times as well as bad. The system has already created a new way of life for the class of people who go on relief and depend for subsistence on monthly

checks from public funds. The worst feature is the lack of any real program of rehabilitation designed to rid the rolls of those who may get on.

In the second place, if unemployable indigents are to become permanent public charges, we should set up foolproof machinery for relief administration. Last year a bill establishing administrative methods for general public assistance was introduced, but failed of enactment. It is up again this year. Mr. HORAN's criticism of the system as rotten should bring it up for consideration.

[From the Washington Post of March 12, 1947]

BUNGLING RELIEF SYSTEM

There is no question as to the necessity for extensive overhauling of the District's welfare system. But we suspect that there will be little concurrence in the local community with Representative Horan's proposals. His chief aim seems to be to change Congress' own policy under which old-age assistance funds and aid to dependent children and to the blind are granted as a matter of right. He thinks there should be a checking up on the spending of such funds after they have been granted. But that would be contrary to the spirit of the Social Security Act and, in our opinion, to sound administration of funds of this character.

In the administration of general public assistance funds, care must be taken, of course, not to continue supporting employable persons if jobs are available to them. But experts who have surveyed the District's relief system say that abuses of this sort are negligible. Rather, the chief difficulty is of a different nature. No emergency relief, it seems, can be given, for it takes a month to check on an application for aid and possibly several weeks more for a pre-audit of each individual case by the District auditor before funds can actually be spent. A system thus tangled in red tape could not possibly function efficiently. Its defeat is obviously lack of flexibility rather than too much of it.

We hope that the House will attempt to bring some order out of this maldroit system. But let the District Committee first get all the facts and clearly visualize the handicaps under which the local welfare officials have been working. We are confident that the only basic solution is the creation of a new department of welfare in a District government responsible to the people. But meanwhile some intermediate improvements will doubtless have to be devised. And certainly the House Appropriation Subcommittee, which is looking into this matter from a superficial viewpoint, will have to grant the requested deficiency appropriation in order to save hundreds of local families from acute hunger between now and next July 1.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to endorse thoroughly the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY]. The adoption of the pending amendment to the bill will impose impossible tasks upon the Coast Guard. When we had an appropriation bill up for consideration the other day there was talk about what the Coast Guard was doing and what grandiose work it was undertaking. The Coast Guard was simply performing tasks that we had imposed upon it.

Now, they want to send around an agent of the Coast Guard to every man who buys a ticket and tell him what waiver has been allowed on a particular ship. The passenger does not know

what it is or what it is all about. When we give him the judgment of selection, that is sufficient, whether he rides or not. He has no choice. If he rides on any other ship he has to ride on a foreign ship if we do not grant this waiver, and if he rides on a foreign ship, the testimony is that he is riding on a ship that is less safe than the American ships.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WEICHEL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GAMBLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 76) authorizing and directing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard, pursuant to House Resolution 130, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE GREEK SITUATION

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a telegram, signed by Joseph Myerson, chairman of the Eastern Pennsylvania Progressive Citizens of America, which takes violent issue with the message of the President on the Greek matter. I have not yet fully made up my mind as to the merits of the President's proposal on the Greek matter, but this effort on behalf of Henry Wallace's PCA crowd in criticism of the President will go far toward inclining me to the belief that what the President has said is true.

In principle, we certainly must support the right of free people to maintain free governments everywhere by moral and economic aid. The degree of that

support is what concerns me. I do not know whether the amount which the President requests is excessive; it may be that he has asked for too much and it may be that to implement his program would merely provide a haven for a number of displaced jobholders who hop like fleas from one Government agency to another. So I want to examine further into the degree to which we should commit ourselves in these matters and the extent to which we must be prepared to go. The fact that the friends of communism, led by Henry Wallace's red-flag boys in the PCA, have rushed in to berate the President and to impugn his motives shows that the Communists fear a firm stand on the part of our Government and their stooges in the left wing are ready to do battle for the Red cause. These are the same people who flourished under the New Deal and in New Deal jobs for many years. Those who are now out of the Government may be expected to cooperate with those left-wingers still inside the Government to divide and sabotage any firm stand against communism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by H. G. Richey.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made today two editorials.

AN EASILY WORKABLE TAX CUT WITH GENERAL RELIEF—H. R. 2539

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include a small table on a tax bill which I have introduced today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am no tax expert. To me, the Internal Revenue Code is an awesome and wonderful thing. I never expect to get beyond the stage where I study tax schedules with fear and trembling. But we all pay taxes. We all struggle with tax returns. You have to think about them whether you want to do so or not.

One of my constituents is an accountant who works on tax returns. He is a very clear-thinking individual and works with taxes at the grass roots. Two days ago I received a suggestion from him which appeared to be so practical and helpful that I thought it should be placed before the Congress.

Accordingly, I reduced the suggestion to the form of a bill and have introduced it today under this title: "A bill to reduce all individual income-tax payments one-twentieth by reducing the rate 5 percent on taxable income; and, to further reduce taxes for those with dependents by increasing the exemptions for a spouse and dependents from \$500 to \$700."

I am advised that its number will be H. R. 2539.

As the title suggests, the bill proposes a primarily simple credit against the current tax of an amount equal to one-twentieth of one's taxable net income.

The effect is to give a somewhat larger percentage tax relief for the taxpayers in the smaller brackets and still give substantial relief to those in the middle and upper brackets on an equitable basis—the same rule to be applied to everybody, but a rule which gives relief in proportion to income ability.

The trouble with some tax-relief proposals, as I understand it, is that in an attempt to treat everyone alike they give the relief in proportion to taxes paid rather than in proportion to ability to pay. This proposal avoids that difficulty. It is very easy to figure because it reduces the present tax by 5 percent for every \$100 of taxable income.

The other part of the bill adds a little more tax relief to those who have dependents, either a spouse or children. Anyone who pays family household bills these days is aware that income earners who provide for more than one person out of a single income have a harder job to make ends meet than those who have a full income for one person alone. This situation is recognized in H. R. 2539 by increasing the exemption for the spouse or any dependent from the present \$500 to \$700, an increase of \$200 which is deductible from total income to determine the net income for tax purposes.

Most proposals to effect tax reduction that have approached the problem by raising exemptions have done so by raising the personal exemption for the first taxpayer as well as the wife or the dependents. One objection made to that is that it is desirable to keep the tax base fairly broad and let everyone share in the burden; that increasing the personal exemption lifts too many taxpayers out of the tax-paying class altogether.

H. R. 2539 does not do that. It leaves the personal exemption for the tax-paying income at \$500 where it now is, but increases the exemption for additional persons living on that income by \$200. The effect is to give a very substantial relief for the taxpayers in the lowest brackets without serious effect on the Nation's revenue.

The simplest way to see what the net effect of these proposals is, is to look at a table which, with the consent of the House, I will place in the RECORD at this point—figures show taxes payable for net surtax income given at left:

Taxable income	Present tax	Straight 20 percent cut	Relief proposed by H. R. 2539		
			1/20 on net	1 dependent	2 dependents
\$100.....	\$20	\$16	\$15	0	0
\$200.....	40	32	30	0	0
\$300.....	60	48	45	\$15	0
\$400.....	80	64	60	30	0
\$500.....	100	80	75	45	\$15
\$600.....	120	96	90	60	30
\$700.....	140	112	105	75	45
\$800.....	160	128	120	90	60
\$900.....	180	144	135	105	75
\$1,000.....	200	160	150	120	90
\$2,000.....	400	320	300	270	240
\$4,000.....	840	672	640	566	544
\$6,000.....	1,360	1,088	1,060	1,008	956
\$10,000.....	2,640	2,112	2,140	2,072	2,014
\$50,000.....	26,820	21,456	24,320	24,176	24,032
\$100,000.....	67,320	53,840	62,320	62,146	61,972
\$200,000.....	156,820	125,456	136,820	136,640	136,460

As will be seen, the plan proposed in H. R. 2539 gives substantial tax relief to

taxpayers all along the line. Below the \$10,000 income, the relief is importantly greater than that afforded by the so-called straight-across-the-board 20-percent plan. Above the \$10,000 line, where taxpaying ability is obviously greater, the actual tax cut is not so great as under the other plan, but still a substantial reduction is effected.

And at the same time the taxpayers all along the line will be still contributing a pretty fair chunk of their income into reduction of the national debt brought on by the war.

One feature of this idea that appealed to me is that it offers a relatively easy method of figuring the reduction—\$5 for each \$100 of taxable income, plus the exemption change for dependents. You do not have to know the different rates for the single taxpayer. It is a flat one-twentieth of each \$100 of the income he pays on and that is \$5.

And that seems fair—application of a tax cut which is proportioned to the taxpayer's ability to pay, rather than proportioned to his tax rate.

As I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I am not a tax expert and there may be some flaws in this proposal, technical and otherwise, but it has several points to commend it, and for that reason I have offered it for the consideration of the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WILL OUR FOREIGN POLICY DESTROY US?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have been giving billions of dollars and millions of tons of munitions of war, of farm machinery badly needed by our own people, to Russia. She has used the things we gave her to increase her military power.

We have been giving billions of dollars to Great Britain to bolster up a Socialist government which, in England, has destroyed free enterprise by taking over private industry.

We have a national debt and Federal expenditures which require of every American 2 days of work out of every 6.

For the past 10 years, the New Deal administration has harbored, encouraged, and placed in positions of power the Communists who have openly advocated the overthrow of this Government by force.

Well do I recall the day when Mrs. Roosevelt, to belittle the efforts of the Dies committee to expose and root out communism, came to the House Office Building as the sponsor of a group of Communists.

The State Department, there is every reason to believe, has been shot through and through with Communists who exert their influence to adversely affect our interests in foreign lands.

The National Labor Relations Board, over the years, wittingly or unwittingly, through design or ignorance, has given aid and comfort to CIO labor unions whose policies were dominated by Communists.

Yesterday the President, coming before Congress without even making an estimate as to the cost or our ability to successfully carry on a third world war,

asked support for a policy which he indirectly admitted would involve us in a third world war.

We fought the First World War to end all war. By bitter experience, we learned that objective was unobtainable.

We fought the Second World War, so we were told, to carry the "four freedoms" to the uttermost parts of the world. Instead, we aided in enslaving the people of Poland, of Finland, of other nations. We delivered hundreds of thousands of prisoners taken by the American Armies into the hands of the British, the French, and the Russians, who have made slaves of them—prisoners who today are slaves.

First we aid England to establish socialism; then, when it fails, we are asked to rush to her aid to maintain a lifeline of the British Empire, which holds millions of people in bondage.

We aid Russia and destroy Germany. We condone and we sanction communism here in our own land and in our own Government. Then we propose, by our money, our munitions of war, and our armed forces, to stop it at the Greek and the Turkish borders.

If, to satisfy the desire of a group of statesmen who proclaim that they are bipartisan in foreign policy; if, to further the interests of the international munition makers; if, to haul down the Stars and Stripes and run up the flag of United Nations or an international rag of any hue or size, our young men and our young women are to fight another war, let us not be deceived by any false notion that that war is to be fought for humanity. Let us recognize it for what it is—the age-old desire of an Alexander or a Napoleon to conquer the world. Only this time the so-called world statesmen, all puffed up by their own fancied importance, cannot decide as to which of them is to be the leader, is to wear the crown and the purple robe.

Because I believe in America, that her interests in my heart should ever be first, I have been called a Fascist, a secessionist, unpatriotic, disloyal. Those things matter not at all if I can in some small way contribute to the effort to keep us out of a third world war; to the effort to avoid surrendering our sovereignty to an international organization.

How silly and how stupid it is to talk about fighting communism at the Turkish or the Greek frontier, fighting it all over the Eastern Hemisphere, then putting at the head of the organization which here in America controls what is said to be the most effective weapon of war, the atomic bomb, a man who was either so inattentive or so deliberately careless of what transpired within his own organization as to permit there to develop a Communist cell—a group who adhered to a party which advocates the overthrow of this Government by force.

Lilienthal may possess all of the intelligence, all of the executive ability attributed to him. Yes; he may have twice all that, but with a Communist cell within his organization, whether they were there because of his lack of attention to his duties or for some other reason, the fact that they were there should be suf-

ficient, in my humble judgment, to bar him from the position to which he was nominated.

How inconsistent for the President to call upon us, not only for money and for supplies, but to follow a course which means the drafting of millions of Americans to fight communism 3,500 miles from home and then to insist upon the appointment as the head of the organization which will control the world's most powerful destructive weapon a man who did not prevent the growth of communism here in one of the Government's largest industrial plants.

What sort of muddled thinking clogs the judgment of Republicans who, November last, were given a mandate to clean out the New Deal, which now finds them supporting an enthusiastic New Dealer? The greater the ability of Lilienthal, the more reason why he, a New Dealer, should be subject to the mandate of the people as expressed November 5 last.

Republican officeholders were not elected by New Deal votes, by the votes of the Communists, nor should they perpetuate the New Deal. That is just what is being done in altogether too many instances. Calling it bipartisan support of a foreign policy does not excuse it.

In the opinion of many, it is unfortunate that the question of Lilienthal's confirmation does not rest with the people's representatives in the House. There Republicans have a real, not a paper, majority.

THE REMEDY?

It is time for the people's representatives to get down to earth. It is time for them to admit and act upon the fact that 60,000,000 workers cannot feed, clothe, build shelter for, 200,000,000 people.

It is time that we realize and act upon the realization that, if we are to engage in continuous warfare to establish our form of government all over the world, we will destroy ourselves.

It is time for us to set our house here at home in order. It is time for us to provide the remedy for labor disputes or at least to prescribe just and equitable rules under which those most interested—employee and employer—can settle their arguments.

It is time for us to embark upon a program of economy and efficiency. It is time for us to begin to make payments on our national debt; to inaugurate a program which will lessen the tax burden of our people.

It is time that we reestablish here in America our constitutional form of government; get rid of the little dictators in the Federal Government who, by order and directive, seek from day to day to deprive the citizen of his liberty, of his opportunity to contribute to the national welfare.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

My attention was distracted as I came in by this picture in this afternoon's edition of the Times-Herald. There is a picture of a lovely, lovely lady of great intellectual attainment. I understand she will speak this afternoon, and just

how foolhardy I am you gentlemen will all realize when you understand that I speak first, and that as always the woman has the last word. But in the picture there she is bending over a counter on which are piled groceries she has just purchased. "Congresswoman gets the goods on the high cost of living," reads the headline.

There is no question but that living costs are going up. There is no question but that the closed shop and the labor monopoly have increased the cost of everything that man buys. There is everywhere a demand for a higher wage. The workingmen in my district get a weekly take-home check of \$32 or \$35.

I will say to the lady who sits here on the right that some of these men with wives and some with wives and several children, complained to me, and justly so, that they cannot buy the goods that the lady has on the counter there, on the wage they get. Under the New Deal there are two or three items there, such as butter and Crisco, yes, and several more, which we could not get at all while we had the OPA, the continuance of which she evidently intends to advocate. Those articles were not on the market at any price. There was a scarcity of many others.

Talk about high wages and the high cost of living, yes; I saw a statement before the Committee on Labor a little while ago when I was there about the starvation wages of \$20 a week back in 1920. On Sunday night I happened to be in the Library Annex looking over some old files of Detroit newspapers. I saw that you could take a round trip up the island of Mackinac and back for less than \$7. I saw that you could buy a bedstead of brass and mattress and springs for less than \$8. I saw that you could buy four oak chairs for less than \$6. Believe it or not. I didn't believe it when I saw it, but then I looked again. There it was in cold print in the Detroit News, the Detroit Free Press, the Detroit Times. I saw all of those things advertised there at what seemed impossibly low prices.

Starvation wages? Yes. Some of us worked, and I mean we worked, for \$12 a week. It was not a starvation wage at that time. We paid 6 cents a dozen for eggs and 6 cents a pound for meat, and I bought round steak instead of sirloin or porterhouse at the same price because there was less bone in the round.

Now, think of it. The question today is not how much is in the pay check. The question is: What will it buy and why are the prices high? Prices are high because, comparatively speaking, there is more money than there are things to buy. Everyone knows that. Talk about pork being high? Sure, it is high. How long ago was the administration advocating the killing of, and actually killing little pigs and old sows? How long ago was it that Henry Wallace and his school of thought said, "Plow under the cotton." He told me that I should use only so many acres of my land to grow wheat. Yet, the lady will complain about the high cost of bread. Some folks do not realize that you have to plow; you have to sow, and plant;

you have to cultivate; you have to harvest; you have to take the produce to the mill.

Oh, this New Deal—sugar? Back in 1935 over in room 1705 in the New House Office Building a group of Republicans from Michigan gathered there in the office of our beloved friend and leader, Carl Mapes, to plead with Henry Wallace who had not yet thought of a pint of milk for everyone in the wide, wide world, and who was then engaged in carrying out his theories. We were gathered there to plead with him for an opportunity to increase the supply of sugar. In my district we wanted instead of 5,000 acres to plant sugar beets to increase it to 6,200 acres because the factory could operate more efficiently and because additional farmers wanted to grow sugar beets. Henry sent up two little men. They came up and said to us, "You cannot have any more acreage in Allegan and Ottawa Counties to grow sugar beets."

We said, "Why?"

"Because, Mr. HOFFMAN, we can grow sugar beets in Colorado with a higher sugar content than you can in Michigan. We are going to grow sugar beets in Colorado and not in Michigan."

I said, "What about my farmers?"

He said, "Oh, they can grow celery or cabbage or cauliflower or something else."

Isn't that fine under our theory of government?

Then I said, "They can make cane sugar down in Louisiana cheaper than they can produce beet sugar in Colorado."

He said, "You are right; how did you know it?"

Well, I did not answer that question. I said, "They can produce sugar cheaper in Florida than they can in Louisiana."

He said, "That is right. Ultimately we are going to grow cane and produce sugar in the offshore areas because it can be done cheaper there than anywhere else."

I said, "Is that your theory—wherever a thing can be grown, produced cheaper, you are going to have it done there all over the world?"

He said, "Yes, sir."

These smart men from Henry Wallace down said, "Yes." Then, perhaps foolishly, I said to him, "If that is your theory of life, why don't you have the Chinamen produce and educate all the children? They can do it cheaper than we can."

He said, "You are crazy."

I said, "So are you." Because that is the logical end of their doctrine. This New Deal has brought us just exactly what the lady from California will say—and what she will not say—scarcity. It has brought you higher prices. It has brought you hungry workingmen and the hungry wives and children of hungry workingmen. Yet they go on in their blind way, and on top of it would, with the aid of bipartisan statesmen, add another war, until the American citizens, who prior to the coming of the New Deal had lived in freedom, prosperity, and happiness, will find themselves in dire want. Yes. That is what the New Deal has brought us to and that is what they

will give us if you follow the theory of my colleague from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The Member from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] will shortly take the floor to talk for half an hour about the high cost of various items, about the high cost of living in general.

She has not made any great discovery. School children, if they stop to think, know that the laws of supply and demand control prices; that an excessive spending of money always sends prices skyrocketing; that the lack of a desire to work creates a scarcity; that relief from the Government creates dependency, contributes to a lack of production.

For more than 12 years, her party, the party of the New Deal, was in complete control of every branch of the Government. It loaded down the Federal pay roll with hundreds of thousands of employees for whom it had no work. By its orders and its directives it hampered and it hindered and it restricted production. It told the people what to do, when to do it, and how to do it.

Financially, economically, productively, the New Deal ruined us and now that their chickens are coming home to roost, now that she and all of us are reaping the harvest which she helped sow, she comes to the well of the House and cries about the high cost of living.

She does not like the chickens that hatched out of the eggs the New Deal laid. The vicious circle which they started whirling, in which they have been caught—high wages and still higher prices, leaving the wage earners always as the chief sufferer.

The New Dealers can weep and shout over the wreckage they have caused, but they lack the courage to make the sacrifices, do the work necessary to bring better days.

A LETTER TO OUR LAWMAKERS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address to the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President of the United States delivered a very serious and extremely important message to the Congress. Most of us, I am sure, realize the very great responsibility we have, not only to our districts, to our country, and to the world, and I am sure we hope and pray that God will give us the wisdom to meet that great responsibility. However, there are times when, perhaps, we should be reminded of that responsibility as it affects our times and the world in which we live. Apropos of this, I insert in the RECORD at this point an article I read recently which is addressed to the Congress of the United States and which, I believe, should be given consideration by every Member who believes, as I do, that the world is looking to the Congress of the United States for world leadership:

[From *Cosmopolitan* magazine of March 1947]

A LETTER TO OUR LAWMAKERS FROM PAUL GALICCO
To the Congress of the United States of America, the Honorable Senators and Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, D. C.

SIRS AND MESDAMES: This day of approaching spring in the Capital of our Nation I am writing to you as an American citizen.

The bursting of the cherry buds into blossom signals the rebirth of the land, the reawakening of love in the hearts of men. Love your country, you who sit in the high places, for if you do not we are lost.

Love it with passion, sincerity, and deep feeling for the land and its people. Give us, this approaching Eastertide, the secure feeling that in your midst are men and women who cherish the concept of the Nation.

Republicans or Democrats, Senators or Representatives, demagogues or statesmen, wise men or fools, you are our shields against the adversities and dangers that beset the land in which we make our homes. If in your hearts there is room only for self, for ambition, local pride, jealousy and spite, there is no hope for any of us who are not merely citizens of a village or town, farm patch or city ward, district or metropolis, county or State, but citizens of a Union of people, and neighbors in a land called America.

When will you who represent us also become Americans? When will you learn to love this country, North, East, South, West, the high, the middle, and the low, as you love the streets and villages where you were born? When will you end the quarrels for petty party advantage that leave us heart-sick and sore and disillusioned as you squabble and bicker for the gain of the little corner from which you come? When will you reward those who send you to high office in the councils of the Nation with simple patriotism and love of country?

Are you smiling? Is this naive, oversimple, and innocent?

I once knew an innocent man who helped to win a war. Never mind his name. He was charged with the accomplishment of an impossibility, the stepping up—in a matter of months—of the productive capacity of the aircraft industry from 35,000 to 50,000, to 75,000 warplanes a year. All the graphs proved conclusively that the factories had not the space, the equipment, or the men to do this.

It was done. It was done largely because this man was not ashamed to call a manufacturer on long-distance telephone and ask if he was flying an American flag over his factory. If he was, he was told that the flag was in trouble. He was urged to go to work for it. Invariably the manufacturer would perform the impossible for love of country.

Are you ashamed and self-conscious when the flag is mentioned or waved? Does it embarrass you when it is used as something more than background, decoration, and scenic design for political clap-trap? There are many of us who are not embarrassed, many of us who cannot encounter it suddenly flying on foreign soil without a tightening in our throats, many millions of us who, in one or the other World War, took an oath committing us to die for it if necessary. One doesn't go around talking about it; one doesn't even think about it much, but it is there. It always has been, this love of our flag, our land, our Nation and its principles, else we would not have survived as we are today.

We know that you have it, too, that you are like us—people with warmth and emotion. But sometimes when we listen to you in your fury and pride of office, in the narrowness of the viewpoint from which you debate that which will affect not only the lives and welfare of the few from your constituency, but

the lives of all of us, in the sordid struggle of living your political life, we feel as though you had forgotten us, Americans and America.

It is spring again. The cherry buds are opening. Open your hearts to the love of your countrymen and your country.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 1 hour.

INCREASED COST OF LIVING

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House what \$15 will buy today in the American grocery and meat store. You see here a basket of food. Yesterday, March 12, in Washington, D. C., I paid \$15 for these articles and the articles in this box, I could have bought last June for \$10, just before the Congress removed price controls—the same amounts and the same quality. The store where these foods were bought is located three blocks from the Capitol; it is not a de luxe store or even a medium-priced store, such as we find in a neighborhood where we \$15,000-a-year Congressmen live. It is the lowest-price chain store in the city. I have here the goods themselves and the sales slips showing the prices item by item.

Mr. Speaker, the food-buying power of a \$10 bill is very important. In my opinion, it is as important and disturbing and as full of economic and political implications and consequences as any weighty, complicated matter that will come to the floor of this House. What does the terrifying shrinkage in the purchasing power of the consumer's food dollar mean to Congress? It has meant to the American people the cashing of millions of dollars of War Savings bonds, and it has caused the fastest increase in installment buying in our history. If rent control is done to death April 30, as this Congress now proposes, rents will jump as food prices have jumped, and the landlords alone know how much. As a result, Nation-wide, there will be more and more wage demands. There will be strikes. Production will be interrupted. Shortages will be transferred into so-called surpluses, as millions find their pockets picked by the lifting of rent controls. There will be trouble beyond anything which we have had in this country since 1931. The lifting of rent controls on top of the high and rising cost of food is just too much.

This heavy burden is too much for the American housewife to bear, and the American wage earner simply is not going to let her bear it.

I want the Members of this House to stop, look, and listen before it is too late. I say that the direct injury to 50,000,000 American renters by the proposed lifting of rent controls must be immediately repaired, for an effective OPA rent-control program regardless of loud utterances to the contrary will end on April 30 unless we take some legislative action. This House decreed that, when it passed the deficiency appropriation bill on March 5 and the conference report which did exactly the same thing on March 11.

You cannot have rent control unless you can enforce rent control. Without

the 649 area rent-control offices there will be no rent control in this country. Nobody cares what you call it, nobody cares who administers it, if you have a program. If you do not like the letters "OPA," call it "GOP"; nobody cares. But, of course, nobody is talking about ending rent control. That is the ironic part of it. Instead, what are they talking about? Raising rents 10 percent in the country when everybody knows you will not have any real rent control after April 30. And right in that fact many an American housewife whose burden is already too heavy to carry thinks she sees the fanciest shell game that has ever been put over on the American people. You certainly have no rent control program when you talk in terms of court enforcement, and that is exactly what is being talked about in Congress—court enforcement. Remember, 50,000,000 American people are involved. If they wake up May 1 with no real rent control but only the promise of court enforcement to be passed by Congress at some indefinite future date what will happen? Well, every Member of Congress knows what will happen. Landlords will raise their rents as of May 1, not the 10 percent that is being talked about around here, but 25, 50, 75, and in some cases, even 100 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield at that point?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. If the gentleman does not mind, I should like to finish my statement. I will do it as quickly as possible. I understand the gentleman's concern as I understood the deep concern of the gentleman from Michigan; but I believe that as I proceed with my presentation the gentlemen will see why there is such deep concern on the opposite side of the aisle.

Mr. KEEFE. It would be perfectly impossible to ask a question pertinent to this point at the end of the lady's speech, which is listed for an hour.

I should like to ask the gentlewoman a simple question in view of the information that the gentlewoman appears to have on this subject, as to the operation of the rent-control law in the event that the appropriation for OPA is denied.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I have listened patiently for days to the opposite side, listened to them discuss rent control, and the propositions which they have made. I should like now to present my case, if the gentleman does not mind.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, the gentlewoman refuses to yield. Is that what I am to understand?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I refuse to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from California declines to yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. We have no rent control when you talk in terms of court enforcement. Landlords will raise their rents from one end of the country to the other on May 1 if the rent-control program ends on April 30 as now proposed by Congress. Evictions will follow. Then the American people perhaps will be invited to take their cases to court. What will happen? You know what will happen. Those cases will be heard when? Six months later? A year later? I do not know. Six weeks later? Three

months later? Fifty million people are involved. Whenever the cases are heard they will not be heard in time to get those families housed again at a price which they can afford to pay.

What is going to be the result if this Congress determines to let rents rise to what is politely called "their natural level in the open market" when in the urban districts alone the country is at least 12,500,000 units short of needed housing.

What is going to be the result of higher rents and evictions of thousands who just cannot pay higher rents on top of higher food costs?

The result will be economic chaos, plus the realization that the Members and the party who told the voters that the abolition of price control would bring lower price have fallen down on their promises. They have fallen down on their promises because the National Association of Manufacturers is falling down on its promises. Those promises were made in full-page ads last May and June, and again in October, when price control was done to death. Incidentally, those ads were mostly paid for by the taxpayers' money. The money was tax deductible by the corporations that put the funds up for the NAM operation and since money spent for these ads was not taxable the American people paid or will pay for the anti-price-control propaganda. In other words, they paid for their own poison and they are paying for it again in higher prices. I say "poison" because this market basket shows that the enemies of price control either could not or would not deliver on their pledge of lower prices.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include both of these ads in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, let us look at these ads. Here is one in the New York Times, Monday, February 18, 1946:

Let's tackle inflation while we can. You don't want your dollars to buy less and less and less. You don't want your savings to melt away; or the value of your life insurance to dwindle! Yet that is what inflation can do to all of us. Therefore, thoughtful people everywhere are concerned with ways to smother it before it gets out of hand. One major cause of inflation is a shortage of goods when people have money to spend for things they want. That cause can be eliminated by the production of goods, fast, and in quantity.

Then they give their answer:

Isn't this the answer? Remove price control on manufactured goods and production will step up fast. This is the way you can get the goods you want at prices you can afford to pay. Please think this over. Then tell your Representatives in Congress what you believe should be done. You owe it to yourself and to your country's welfare.

Signed "The National Association of Manufacturers, for a Better Tomorrow for Everybody."

Then there is this ad that appeared in the New York Times of July 3, 1946:

The future with confidence. The members of the National Association of Manufacturers

have no intention of rocking the inflation boat now or any other time. If OPA is permanently discontinued the production of goods will mount rapidly, and through free competition, prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels the consumers are willing to pay. Then as production gets rolling again supply will catch up with demand—prices will be fair and reasonable to all—quality will be improved—black markets will disappear and America will enter the period of prosperity that everyone has been hoping for.

The National Association of Manufacturers. For a better tomorrow for everybody.

Now, I will show you at the end of my talk that the merchants, the National Association of Manufacturers and the businessmen themselves in the country are disturbed and worried about these rising prices. Every present indication is that prices are going higher for the next several months; every indication is that this new wave of price increases, plus run-away rentals, will make it impossible for the American families to live on present wages.

Those members of the Republican Party who in good faith promised lower prices are now left holding the bag. Their predicament will become even more painful when higher rents begin to bite big pieces out of millions of low incomes.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me those Members should reconsider their position, both as citizens and as Members. I say to them, "Do not look now, but a very lively ghost is at your shoulders. It is the high cost of living. A step behind him is his homicidal brother the gaunt figure of deflation, alias recession, alias depression, alias unemployment, alias national economic stagnation, anemia, and disunity."

The polite names for these two ghosts are Boom and Bust.

To the housewives of this country both Boom and Bust mean tragedy. That tragedy is both personal and national, Mr. Speaker.

The enemies of price control and rent control have sowed the wind. Unless they act to continue effective rent controls, priorities and allocations of scarce materials; unless they quickly supply housing for millions of veterans and others now doubled up in flats, huts, trailers, and basements, and for others lacking housing altogether, they are going to reap the whirlwind in 1948.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is bigger than it was in the twenties. Its velocity and momentum are greater. It works faster. The political penalties for failure will come faster.

If I were a blindly partisan person, Mr. Speaker, I would be silent. But I must speak out.

The health, the security, the opportunity, the very life of millions, our security and strength as a Nation, are at stake. Our hope of doing our full share in holding the civilized world together is at stake.

I appeal to every Member to pay heed to the facts about the high and rising cost of living and the shrinking of wages, salaries, and fixed incomes for the people of this country as disclosed by the figures and reports I am about to present.

Let us see what is happening in the shadow of the Capitol dome. Our economic policy is made here in the Halls of Congress, Mr. Speaker, and it comes out there, in the sales slips I hold in my hand.

This chart tells part of the story of the high and rising cost of living. I am going to give you item by item the cost of food I bought yesterday for \$15, and I am going to give you the prices that this food was purchased for last June here in Washington, D. C. In most cases these June prices are for the same article, the same brand, in the same store. In a few cases where this information was not available I have used Bureau of Labor Statistics' figures for last June.

In June, 10 pounds of flour, 78 cents; yesterday, 10 pounds of flour, 87 cents.

One pound of butter, same brand, 65 cents in June; yesterday, 82 cents.

Two quarts of milk. Twenty-nine cents was the average price in Washington in June; 25 cents was the price at this store in June, and yesterday I paid 34 cents for the same milk, same brand, 2 quarts.

One dozen eggs in June, 53 cents; yesterday, 69 cents; same brand, same store.

Two pounds of dried prunes, same brand, same store, in June, 32 cents; yesterday, 54 cents.

Three pounds of ground round steak, same store, same quality, in June, \$1.35; and yesterday, \$2.07, a rise of 72 cents.

Two pounds of pork chops in June, 76 cents—and that is the poor man's meat which the gentleman from Michigan told us about—yesterday cost, \$1.46.

One pound of Swift's Premium bacon, not a poor man's meat, but he likes to get a piece once in a while, 42 cents in June, and 79 cents yesterday.

Three pounds of Crisco, which every family has to have or its equivalent, 68 cents in June, and yesterday, \$1.27.

One quart of Wesson oil, 58 cents in June; 90 cents yesterday.

Two pounds of Maxwell House coffee, 66 cents in June, and 98 cents yesterday. And, remember, you cannot separate an American from his coffee.

One pound of sausage, 45 cents in June, and 49 cents yesterday.

Two pounds of stew beef, scarcely a luxury item, 70 cents in June, and \$1.18 yesterday.

Three cans of string beans, 39 cents in June; and 60 cents yesterday.

Three cans of peas, 45 cents in June, same quality, same store; and 55 cents yesterday.

Two loaves of bread. Twenty-two cents was the average in Washington in June. Yesterday it was 20 cents.

One pound of margarine. This is called the poor man's butter. Margarine, 18 cents, same brand, same store, in June; 43 cents yesterday.

Two pounds of soda crackers, 42 cents in June, 50 cents yesterday.

A pound and a half of soap chips. Soap is not a food item, but you cannot wash without it. You have to wash dishes, you have to wash pots and pans. Soap is one of the things that goes into the kitchen with every food basket. It was 25 cents in June. That was the

average price in the city. Yesterday in this store, the cheapest chain store in Washington, it was 34 cents.

So what you could buy in June for \$10.08, yesterday you paid \$15.02 for.

We have here meat, eggs, dairy products, fats and oils, canned goods, packaged goods, and beverages. Economists generally agree that such foods constitute over 65 percent of the average household food demands.

In June of 1946, \$10 would have paid for these sample items which are basic in any household food budget.

By March of 1947, 8 months later, we find that the NAM promise has not worked out. What was that promise? Remember?

"If we would just get rid of price control we could get the goods we wanted at prices we could afford to pay."

Well, gentlemen, it takes \$15 to buy exactly the same articles that could have been bought last June for \$10—that is the way it has worked out.

In other words, the cost of these basic food items has risen 50 percent since last June when we ended effective price control.

This fantastic price rise illustrated by the foods in this basket is symptomatic of a national trend.

I quote a statement from the BLS in its release to the press of March 6, 1947, regarding wholesale prices for week ending March 1. It states:

Food prices also rose, influenced by the general market conditions with the group index up 3.1 percent during the week to a level 55.2 percent above a year earlier.

This wholesale food rise of 55 percent is reflected in 65 percent of what a housewife buys in her market.

The remaining food she must buy, fresh fruits, vegetables, cereals, and sweets, although slightly more expensive than in June, have not yet been caught in this rapidly increasing spiral.

By very careful management, a housewife can average out her food budget between 30 and 35 percent above what she paid last June, depending of course, on where she buys and in what part of the country she lives.

The American housewife today must have 30 to 35 percent more money in her pocket in order to buy the same products which she bought last June, in order to feed her family. Has she got it? That, gentlemen, is the \$64 question.

How are people living? The answer is that some of them are not getting the kind of food they should get with these rising costs.

Do you recall, gentlemen, what the over-all food price rise was for the 4 years that preceded last June? It was 15 percent. Fifteen percent in 4 years' time under price control, and 30 to 35 percent rise in 8 months after price controls were removed.

Now I would like to place this basket where it belongs—squarely in the lap of the Republican Party.

These price increases should make it plain why wage increases since VJ-day have been wiped out. On top of that,

as shown in the wage table printed in the magazine Business Week, which I inserted in the RECORD, February 27, wages in the fall of 1946 are lower than in mid-1945. The buying power of wages has shrunk since then. It will shrink again if we persist in blowing the lid off rents.

Mr. Speaker, for the convenience of

the Members, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD, the wage table printed in the magazine Business Week for February 15, 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

[From Business Week of February 15, 1947]

	Average weekly income available for spending in terms of 1939 dollars			Percent change in real income available for spending		
	1939	Mid-1945	Autumn, 1946	1939 to mid-1945	Mid-1945 to autumn 1946	1939 to autumn 1946
Manufacturing industries:						
Iron and steel	27.20	36.50	31.50	+34	-14	+16
Electrical machinery	26.80	35.00	30.80	+21	-12	+15
Machinery, except electrical	29.00	38.40	32.90	+32	-14	+13
Automobiles	32.60	38.20	33.10	+17	-13	+2
Transportation equipment except autos	30.20	41.50	33.50	+39	-19	+12
Nonferrous metals	26.50	35.50	31.00	+34	-13	+17
Lumber	18.00	25.00	25.40	+32	+2	+34
Furniture and finished lumber products	19.80	27.00	27.10	+39	+2	+37
Stone, clay, and glass	23.70	30.10	28.60	+27	-5	+21
Textile products	16.70	23.50	24.70	+41	+5	+48
Apparel	18.00	22.70	23.80	+26	+5	+32
Leather and products	19.00	26.40	24.00	+39	-9	+26
Food manufacturing	24.20	29.80	28.30	+23	-5	+17
Tobacco products	16.70	23.00	23.90	+38	+4	+43
Paper and products	23.50	30.40	29.20	+29	-4	+24
Printing and publishing	32.10	34.20	33.90	+7	-1	+6
Chemicals	25.30	33.20	29.20	+31	-12	+15
Petroleum and coal refining	32.30	41.00	34.00	+27	-17	+5
Rubber products	27.60	37.30	32.30	+35	-14	+17
Miscellaneous	24.20	32.20	28.90	+33	-10	+19
Mining industries:						
Anthracite coal	25.40	34.70	37.90	+37	+9	+49
Bituminous coal	23.60	36.60	38.30	+55	+5	+62
Metal	27.80	33.60	31.40	+21	-1	+13
Nonmetals and quarrying	21.40	32.00	30.80	+50	-4	+44
Crude petroleum	33.80	38.90	34.50	+15	-11	+2
Transportation	31.40	37.20	35.50	+18	-5	+13
Public utilities	32.10	33.60	31.50	+5	-6	-2
Finance	31.20	32.60	30.00	+4	-8	-4
Service	16.20	21.30	20.50	+31	-4	+27
Construction	24.10	36.70	33.50	+52	-9	+39
Retail trade	21.00	22.00	21.50	+5	-2	+2
Wholesale trade	29.60	33.20	31.50	+12	-5	+6
Federal Government (civilian)	38.80	42.60	35.50	+10	-17	-9
State and local governments	25.60	23.80	23.50	-7	-1	-8
Public education	26.10	22.50	21.00	-14	-7	-20
Agriculture and related industries	7.60	14.90	14.50	+96	-3	+91

Data are estimates by Business Week, based on information published by the Department of Labor and the Department of Commerce. Because statistical adjustments of the character applied to the basic data leave results that are only approximations of the true averages, the statistics for weekly income available for spending have been rounded out to the nearest 10 cents and in some cases to the nearest 50 cents. Thus, the figures for mid-1945 and autumn 1946 are of use chiefly as an indication of the general magnitude of the change in real income.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, our \$200,000,000,000 economy cannot be kept healthy on a diet of profits alone. We must have consumption to keep up production, and they must be in balance.

What does the Republican Party, what do the leaders of that party now in control of the Congress, what do the tycoons of American business and industry propose to do about this dangerous lack of balance now in our economy, about the fact that 1947 corporation profits are expected to surpass 1946 profits, that reached the all-time high of \$11,800,000,000 after taxes? Do they see anything dangerous in a situation in which prices rise, profits rise, and real wages fall?

Their remedy is to double the dose, the course of treatment that has aggravated the disease to date.

They propose a tax cut for the future relief and greater profit of the greedy, not the needy. Some of them, and particularly in this House, propose to put across-the-board tax cuts ahead of everything else, ahead of national defense, of necessary social services, of adequate antitrust enforcement, of wealth-producing investment, particularly in the West. And—shades of Mc-

Kinley and Andrew Mellon—it has been proposed that tax cuts be put even ahead of debt reduction.

What most independent businessmen want, I am convinced, are stable prices for materials and products, stable markets so that they can make plans and carry them out without going broke.

If we are going to get our postwar domestic affairs in order so that businessmen can make such plans, this Congress must do something about the hard facts of what it costs people to live.

This Congress must recover and keep a healthy balance between prices, wages, and profits during the next few years when our own demand for goods and the world's need for goods are certain to exceed our capacity to produce. To do so will be for Congress to take such action to protect independent business and genuine free enterprise.

I would remind the Members that we undertook to do just this a little more than a year ago when the Congress passed the employment act.

Today, that act is being honored more in the breach than in the observance.

Acting on recommendations, of the Board of Economic Advisers, created by

that act, the President has made certain immediate and long-run recommendations for maintaining a healthy equilibrium in our economy.

The joint congressional committee, also created by that act, has treated the President's report as a hot potato. It has juggled it and set it aside to cool, and perhaps to be forgotten. The committee solemnly told the country that it could not express an opinion on the immediate problems mentioned in the President's report because various congressional committees were now dealing with them. It stated that the long-run problems were long run, and, therefore, need not be dealt with quickly. They could wait until the committee would assemble a staff.

Mr. Speaker, allowing for differences in numbers, if General Marshall and General Hershey had assembled the Army with the same speed now being displayed by this joint congressional committee, the war would still be on—assuming we had not been beaten, invaded, and overrun.

Unless that committee does get to work on both the immediate and long-run recommendations of the President, unless it comes up with some practical measures for maintaining economic health, we are going to be beaten, invaded, and overrun by depression, as in 1920 and 1929, and for the same reasons.

Congressional leaders have not had time for this. But they had time to frame bills and cut appropriations kicking the lid off rent controls, reneging on our promises made to veterans in the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act and wrecking what is left of priorities and allocations in CPA. By their standards, the standards of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover era, the Republican leaders have put first things first; namely, profits.

Unfortunately, if this course is continued, the damage will not be confined to the hopes of the Republican Party, already beginning to wither and turn yellow around the edges. The American people will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, you think of such matters when you see housewives shopping for food these days, when you see them matching their \$10 bills and their \$5 bills and their \$1 bills and their silver and pennies against the labels and the price tags in the grocery stores and the butcher shops of this country. That is where the fine campaign promises of last year and next year pay off or fail to pay off.

The reckless decontrol program—for business—and the ferocious control program now being formulated for labor—are wrong and impossible, and businessmen begin to feel this in their bones. They realize it out of their own experience.

I have here a letter dated February 28, 1947, from a small businessman of Los Angeles, Calif. He is a wholesaler, dealing in lighting fixtures and other electrical supplies. I omit his name lest by chance he be embarrassed in some of his business relationships.

He says:

It is imperative to continue steel priorities. If controls are lifted, prices will skyrocket

above today's high levels and will harm not only the building industry, but also the country's entire financial stability.

We urge you to vote for continued controls over the steel.

There is a businessman who has had enough of the NAM-GOP pie-in-the-sky propaganda. He would rather hold on to what has brought him through the past 6 years than to go down in the anarchy that would result from washing out priorities and allocations at a time when our supply of steel is still inadequate to meet the competing demands of transportation, construction, automobiles, and other industries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include at the end of my remarks seven items which, in my opinion, establish the fact that honest conservatives, believers in genuine free enterprise, are disturbed and alarmed about the high cost of living and the dangerous effects of further price increases upon our economy and industrial peace.

First. The text of an article by Mr. Russell Porter, published in the Business News Section of the New York Times, March 2, 1947, from which I shall read certain passages.

Second. Excerpts from an article in the same paper of the same date by Mr. C. F. Hughes, business news editor of the New York Times.

Third. Excerpts from the February 28 issue of the United States News, of which the noted commentator, David Lawrence, is editor.

Fourth. An article from the New York Times of March 6, 1947, reporting purchasing agents' fear that rising commodity prices may wreck retail efforts at stabilization.

Fifth. An article by the distinguished reporter and commentator, Mr. Thomas L. Stokes, giving a Mississippi country merchant's price list on food for a share cropper's family and showing a 74-percent increase over last year. This article was published in the Washington Daily News, March 8, 1947.

Sixth. A news dispatch from Chicago, dated March 8, 1947, reporting the statesmanlike decision of International Harvester Co. to reduce its prices \$20,000,000 a year before April 1 because of a feeling that prices are generally too high.

Seventh. A news story from the New York Post of March 10 on New York food prices.

Before calling particular attention to Mr. Porter's article, Mr. Speaker, it should be explained that he appears to have been assigned for the past year to be a kind of psychiatrist to American industry and business. Week after week he has presented the views, the hopes, and the arguments of American business and industry and its plans for meeting postwar problems and opportunities.

On March 2 Mr. Porter seemed to have had enough. He said—I want to read this, word for word:

In the grand ballroom of the big hotel in Chicago last week various speakers warned a meeting of the American Management Association that the future of the free-enterprise system depended upon business and industry improving their human relations

with the public; that is, with their workers and their consumers as human beings. Top management was held to be fumbling the ball in this most important and difficult field.

In the lobbies of the same hotel and in the nearby business offices and streets of Chicago's famous Loop, the nerve center of the great Midwest industrial and agricultural regions which come together there, this reporter found strong support for such a view of the current public relations of the American economic system.

Chicago's newspapers were headlining \$30 hogs, highest on record; predicting \$1 a pound pork chops in a few days, so that what has been traditionally the poor man's meat has become a luxury product, and reporting March wheat at the highest price since 1920. Prices of clothing were also on the climb.

Businessmen and economists in the middle-income brackets were complaining about being priced out of the market themselves for new homes, automobiles, and other manufactured articles which the economists call durable consumer goods.

And everybody, rich, poor, or in-between, was talking about the huge profits being reported and the fat dividend melons being cut by many of the country's large corporations.

Obviously, here is a problem in public relations which reaches right down to the grass roots of what people as individual human beings, not as statistics in an official report or lines on a chart, have to pay for what they eat, wear, live in, or otherwise use in their daily lives, what they can afford to buy, how long they can remain customers or potential customers, except for the bare necessities, of the products of American industry, and how all this will affect their confidence in the American system as a whole.

Mr. Porter then poses his warning, and it is a warning I think that every Member of the House should ponder. I quote:

The time is getting close when industry must find an answer to this problem that will satisfy the public in the next 60 or 90 days. Management will have to deal with postponed wage demands in coal, steel, automobile, telephone, electrical, railroad, and other strategic industries.

Mr. Speaker, by striking at rent control and by proposals to wipe out our housing priorities and allocations, Congress itself has hastened the day of the show-down, Mr. Porter predicts. He warns that the new upsurge of prices and higher rents will affect future wage negotiations. He says—and I quote:

If the new upsurge of commodity prices is not checked, if rent ceilings are raised suddenly and indiscriminately, the effect on coming wage negotiations may be very bad.

Mr. Porter says further, and I quote:

Another big inflationary spurt, pricing more and more buyers out of the market, it is held may eventually result in huge unsaleable surpluses which might have to be dumped on the market at a terrific loss, causing business failures, mass lay-offs and depression. Many businessmen concede privately that prices are too high and should be reduced voluntarily and gradually now in order to stop the inflationary spiral and forestall the deflationary one that might follow a forced and sharp break in prices later. But, with a few exceptions, everybody seems to be waiting for the other fellow's prices to be cut first.

So what should be done?

Members will do well to give thought to Mr. Porter's answer.

So will the officers and the dues-paying members of the NAM.

Here is Mr. Porter's prescription:

National leadership appears to be required, but so far has been lacking either to reduce prices or explain convincingly why this cannot be done. Of course, neither the Government nor a private organization like the National Association of Manufacturers has the power to compel any businessman to reduce prices, but each has a great deal of moral authority, and an appeal from either, coming on the eve of major wage negotiations, would be hard to ignore.

To the NAM, Mr. Porter suggests "action in the public interest." International Harvester's price cuts are a sample of what could be done along this line.

To this House, I suggest "action in the public interest"—and fast. Mr. Porter says we have great moral authority. He suggests we exercise it before it is too late. I say Amen.

Let us get down to our business, which is outlined in the Employment Act of 1946 and spelled out in the President's recommendations thereunder. Mr. Porter suggests we have 60 to 90 days to avert disaster.

If we persist in wrecking rent control April 30, it is later than we think.

Mr. Speaker, the times call for national unity and singleness of purpose in domestic as well as in international affairs. In a very real sense, the world crisis with which our President and committees of the Congress are dealing on a day-to-day emergency basis has its counterpart in the rapidly developing crisis here at home that comes into sharp focus when you see what \$15 will buy in the way of food.

If we are to do our part in holding the world together in an effort to achieve freedom for all peoples and, therefore, for ourselves, it is imperative that we face up to attack and lick this problem of the high cost of living before it tears loose in a spiral of run-away inflation and a new outbreak of industrial strife.

Abroad and at home, pits of conflict and chaos appear to open before our feet. If we hesitate, temporize, or attempt to evade the courses of action that economic, political, and social justice dictate, we can lose.

If we act with courage, decision, and speed, in a spirit of national unity which the emergency demands, the pits will close and we can go forward to prosperity at home and peace in the world.

As on March 4, 1933, and at Pearl Harbor, it is equally true today that "we have nothing to fear but fear itself."

Let us draw together and again rise to meet the challenges and the opportunities that confront us. Then in deed as in words, Mr. Speaker, "America the Beautiful" will be more truly beautiful in the eyes of all our people and in the eyes of all the freedom loving peoples of the world.

This is America's moment. May we prove our democratic faith by our works at home and abroad.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I have any time left I shall be very happy to answer any questions.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman and apologize because I felt I had to make my few remarks first.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that I have listened with great interest to the very fine statement the gentlewoman has made. I would like to ask her, however, just what she specifically recommends out of this general statement that she has made appealing to the Congress and to the public? What does she recommend that this Congress do to alleviate the situation of which she complains?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. As the gentleman can see if he followed my remarks—

Mr. KEEFE. I did follow the gentlewoman's remarks very carefully.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I am trying to sound an alarm before it is too late on the question of rent control. I feel it would be disastrous if rents were allowed to skyrocket as food prices have skyrocketed since we did away with an effective price-control program in June.

Now, the gentleman asks me how would I do it. I do not say it to be facetious; but if you do not like the words OPA, call it anything else you like, but keep a real rent-control program. But, as long as there is a great housing shortage in the country, as long as we have not yet housed our veterans, we ought to keep rent control. That was promised by this Congress last year when you killed OPA. Almost no one came out and said they wanted to kill the rent-control program.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentlewoman that I am in complete accord with that, but I think that so far as I personally am concerned, and with the thesis of attempting to hold down rents in view of the situation facing the Nation, I think that this Congress has expressed itself and did express itself. What I would like to have the gentlewoman answer is the question that concerns me as an individual Member of Congress what I am going to be able to do and what others are going to be able to do in view of the alarm which the gentlewoman has sounded and generated, and which some of us have also generated and sounded? What are we going to do about it, and how? That is what I would like to know.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman is talking about the over-all program? I thought I made myself clear in my speech. I wish you would follow the recommendation of the President of the United States under the Employment Act.

Mr. KEEFE. We are talking about rent control now.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. All right, talk about rent control. You have to keep the 649 area rental offices, and you cannot have rent control through a court enforcement system, and that is what is being proposed.

Mr. KEEFE. That bill is before the President now.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. That is right, and I hope he vetoes it.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the gentlewoman's position is that he should veto that bill, the deficiency bill, which is now up there?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. If vetoing the bill could save the rent-control program, yes,

but in the last analysis it has to come back to this Congress, and the gentleman who is talking represents the majority party.

Mr. KEEFE. Do not dignify me with that compliment. I am not.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. All I am saying is that you cannot have a rent-control program unless you can control rents, unless you can enforce them at the grass roots. Everybody knows that. To talk of anything else is to talk sheer nonsense and pretend you are giving something to the American people which you are not giving, and it is up to the majority party in Congress, who are supposed to have the leadership, to lead.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the gentlewoman is handling the gentleman so well that I will desist.

Mr. KEEFE. It is very obvious that the distinguished whip, who used to be the majority leader, has been sitting on the hot spot, so to speak, attempting to help the gentlewoman. I think the gentlewoman is perfectly able to take care of herself; I believe that. I am simply asking the gentlewoman a simple question that I am just as much interested in as she is, or the people of Los Angeles. We are interested in this question of rent control.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Then do something about it.

Mr. KEEFE. I am asking the gentlewoman—

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Why did you kill the only instrument that is capable of holding down rent control?

Mr. KEEFE. My dear lady—

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I mean, the gentleman's interest is not going to keep the rent down for 50,000,000 American people.

Mr. KEEFE. That, of course, is a very impassioned statement.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It is an impassioned statement, and if the gentleman will go with me out to the grocery stores here and talk to anybody, any of the people on the street, and know the concern which they are feeling, he will be impassioned, too. I am impassioned. I am not making this speech for political capital. I am making this speech in the vain hope, perhaps, that the majority party will do something before it is too late, because if these rental offices go out April 30, you cannot reinstate them. You can say, "I am sorry." It is too late. But that will not help.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentlewoman this question? The gentlewoman has said that the whole program will go out and there is no use fooling the American people.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman knows it will go out.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not talking about rent control.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I say, the gentleman knows it will go out. The gentleman voted for it to go out.

Mr. KEEFE. Rent control still remains; does it not?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. What good does that do? What good does it do to have rent control if you cannot have the area rent control offices?

Mr. KEEFE. I am a renter. I live in an apartment.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman will find out.

Mr. KEEFE. I will find out. You bet I will find out and that is what the gentlewoman ought to tell the people of America because—

Mrs. DOUGLAS. What good does that do? They do not care whether you find out.

The average wage in America is \$47.58. That family already has its budget bursting at the seams to buy meat, potatoes, coffee, eggs, and milk. According to my sampling, the housewife is not able to buy oranges and grapefruit any more.

Mr. KEEFE. I know that.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Because that family does not have enough money left in its budget. They have to get meat, potatoes, eggs, and milk. There is no money for oranges. If there is anybody here from Florida, he knows that is one of the things that is making the Florida people so sick right at the moment. People do not care whether you are uncomfortable or not; they care whether they are uncomfortable; they are worried that the landlord to whom they are paying at this moment \$30 or \$40 a month is going to come in May 1 and say, "You will pay, Mr. Brown, \$80 a month or you will get out." And who is going to prevent it? And then the Republican Party invites him, when they get around to passing the law, to go to the court.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the point.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The court will have millions of cases before it eventually. Here is this case. What will Mr. Brown and his children do? They do not care whether you are uncomfortable or not. They care whether they are uncomfortable.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, I have never had a conversation with the gentlewoman before. I see the impossibility of even getting a word in, because she has the floor.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not want to be facetious. I do not think this is a facetious matter. It affects 50,000,000 American families. I am trying to talk for the American people.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, let me ask this.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It is going to be too late when they talk in 1948. They will have been thrown out of their houses by then.

Mr. KEEFE. Again I struggle to get one word in in order to ask my question, and I hope the record will show that.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. They do not care what the record shows here. They will not care about the record when they are thrown out of their houses.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I surrender back the balance of my time. No one can go against that.

[From the New York Times of March 2, 1947]
PUBLIC-RELATIONS PROBLEM PRESSED UPON
MANAGEMENT — NEW RELATIONS WITH
WORKERS AND CUSTOMERS SEEN NECESSITATED BY PRICE OUTLOOK

(By Russell Porter)

In the grand ballroom of a big hotel in Chicago last week various speakers warned a meeting of the American Management As-

sociation that the future of the free-enterprise system depended upon business and industry improving their human relations with the public—that is, with their workers and their consumers as human beings. Top management was held to be fumbling the ball in this most important and difficult field.

In the lobbies of the same hotel and in the nearby business offices and streets of Chicago's famous Loop, the nerve center of the great Midwest industrial and agricultural regions which come together there, this reporter found strong support for such a view of the current public relations of the American economic system.

Chicago's newspapers were headlining \$30 hogs, highest on record; predicting \$1-a-pound pork chops in a few days, so that what has been traditionally the poor man's meat has become a luxury product, and reporting March wheat at the highest price since 1920. Prices of clothing were also on the climb. Businessmen and economists in the middle-income brackets were complaining about being priced out of the market themselves for new homes, automobiles, and other manufactured articles which the economists call durable consumer goods.

And everybody, rich, poor, or in-between, was talking about the huge profits being reported and the fat dividend melons being cut by many of the country's large corporations.

Obviously, here is a problem in public relations which reaches right down to the grass roots of what people as individual human beings, not as statistics in an official report or lines on a chart, have to pay for what they eat, wear, live in, or otherwise use in their daily lives, what they can afford to buy, how long they can remain customers or potential customers, except for the bare necessities, of the products of American industry, and how all this will affect their confidence in the American system as a whole.

The time is getting close when industry must find an answer to this problem that will satisfy the public. In the next 60 or 90 days management will have to deal with the postponed wage demands in the coal, steel, automobile, telephone, electrical, railroad, and other strategic industries.

It had been hoped that the cost-of-living decline that began in December would continue and spread sufficiently to limit the extent of second-round wage increases necessary to satisfy the workers and prevent another wave of major strikes in 1947.

Then, it had been expected, uninterrupted mass production and increased productivity due to a more cooperative attitude on the part of rank-and-file labor since election day, an improved flow of materials since the end of price controls, and postwar technological improvements would gradually provide a tremendous flow of goods at reduced production costs.

This, it was believed, might ease the country down to a lower price level without a depression and mass unemployment, and set the stage for a sustained period of prosperity supported by high-level production and employment and a better balanced wage-price-profit relationship from the standpoint of both consumer purchasing power and savings for investment in new production and employment.

But the new upsurge of commodity prices has disturbed these expectations. If it is not checked, and if rent ceilings are raised suddenly and indiscriminately, the effect on the coming cost-of-living wage negotiations may be very bad.

As the February bulletin of the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago pointed out before the upsurge, that district's average weekly "real" earnings in manufacturing industries (in terms of buying power) have declined since VJ-day because of the rise in the cost of living, despite last year's first-round wage rate increases. It held that second-round

increases of 10 percent, a point at which many businessmen have been hoping they could be held, would restore real wages to VJ-day levels only if prices remained constant, whereas a further advance of 5 percent in the cost of living would require a 15 percent rise in wage rates to reestablish end-of-war real earnings, and so on. By the same token, it was shown, a 5 percent decline in the cost of living would reduce the required wage increase to 5 percent.

ALTERNATIVES AND RESULTS

If the unions by strike or threat of strike force excessive wage increases, or if management grants such increases as a matter of appeasement in the hope of protecting the present rate of profits, so that further price increases nullify the benefits to those workers who receive wage increases, and put a severe squeeze on those nonunion white-collar groups that get no raises, economists warn that the results to the national economy may be disastrous.

Another big inflationary spurt, pricing more and more buyers out of the market, it is held, may eventually result in huge unsalable surpluses, which might have to be dumped on the market at a terrific loss, causing business failures, mass lay-offs and depression.

Many businessmen concede privately that prices are too high and should be reduced voluntarily and gradually now in order to stop the inflationary spiral and forestall the deflationary one that might follow a forced and sharp break in prices later. But, with a few exceptions, everybody seems to be waiting for the other fellow's prices to be cut first.

National leadership appears to be required, but so far has been lacking, either to reduce prices or explain convincingly why this cannot be done. Of course, neither the Government nor a private organization like the National Association of Manufacturers has the power to compel any businessman to reduce prices, but each has a great deal of moral authority, and an appeal from either, coming on the eve of major wage negotiations, would be hard to ignore.

At its annual meeting last December the NAM acknowledged its responsibility for putting forward positive and constructive proposals in the public interest for the solution of national problems affecting the economic and social welfare of the people. Subsequently it sponsored a meeting of public relations executives for business and industry, at which the keynote was expressed that good public relations for American free enterprise rest upon two foundations: 1. Action in the public interest; 2. Full public information.

This is a new policy for the NAM, which has admitted its error in failure to offer anything more than mere opposition to New Deal proposals for changes in the public interest between 1932 and 1946. Many observers are watching the present situation with interest as a test of the new policy.

[Excerpt from the Merchant's Point of View, by C. F. Hughes, business news editor, the New York Times, March 2, 1947]

To all intents and purposes OPA disappeared 6 months ago, so that it would appear that there has been almost enough time to test out the theory that prices would not get out of hand when left to the devices of a free market. Production meantime has been running at record levels and far above prewar rates.

The over-all evidence, however, is that there has been little slowing down in the general advance. Thus the wholesale price-commodity index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the week ended February 22 rose again to another postwar peak. The increase for the month was 2.9 percent and

for the year 34.4 percent. Farm product prices were 1.7 percent higher for the week and within 0.2 percent of their late November peak. Food prices were 50 percent higher than 12 months ago and manufactured products 35 percent.

What the resurgence of price inflation means, in the opinion of informed observers, is that business is riding for a harder fall than the moderate readjustment and recession period which has been predicted so generally for later in the year. The Civilian Production Administration emphasized this point in a statement issued toward the close of the week.

The over-all evidence is therefore discouraging from the standpoint of believing that business would exercise the price and profit restraint necessary to keep demand in a healthy state.

[From the United States News of February 28, 1947]

NEWSGRAM

Chances are that price rises under way will be the last of this inflation. Any more sharp rises from this level almost surely would choke off much demand.

Living costs are going to rise somewhat further due to new price rises. Meats, for example, are to cost more. Mark-ups still are being made on clothing.

Rents are due to take a sharp rise in the second half of 1947.

A new car won't cost less before late 1947, if then. It is the same with electrical equipment for the house. Housefurnishings aren't declining in price.

Cost of building is getting up to rather fantastic heights. The rise in price of building materials since prewar has been greater than the rise after World War I that stopped the first postwar building boom in its tracks.

Of course, it always is possible that the cycle can take another turn in an upward direction, with a new wave of wage increases followed by a new wave of price increases. That is a rather slim prospect, though, now that production is rolling in a big way. Wage rates will go up some, but if prices rise much more there can be a sudden and severe check to many kinds of demands.

Just to give you an idea of how high prices already have risen:

Farm products, at wholesale, are up 159 percent since 1939.

Foods, among farm products, are up 129 percent in the same period.

All other commodities, as a whole, have risen 58 percent at wholesale.

Building materials cost 91 percent more than before the war. Cost of these materials has risen 23 percent in 13 weeks and still is skyrocketing.

Textile products, at wholesale, are 94 percent higher than in prewar.

A very large price inflation obviously has occurred. Inflation still is under way in many prices. The bigger the inflation, the harder the fall when the break comes, as it always does when things have moved up this much.

A house built at these levels would be built at or near the cycle top.

Old-house values will remain high so long as building costs are high and so long as demand for dwellings is greater than the supply.

Apartment house and other rental-housing construction will continue to be discouraged so long as building costs are high and rents are held low.

Any real slow-down in construction can have important effects upon business in general. With construction prices up where they are, and rising, there is growing doubt whether volume of construction can be maintained through 1947.

Building materials, farm products, textiles are price-danger spots.

[From the New York Times of March 6, 1947]
CALL RISING PRICES HOLD-LINE THREAT—PURCHASING AGENTS SAY TREND IN MATERIALS MAY WRECK RETAIL EFFORTS FOR STABILIZATION—COMMODITY GAINS CITED—COVER NEW PEAKS IN METALS, HOGS, BEEF, WHEAT—DISCOUNT COPPER DUTY CUT FOR RELIEF

Efforts to "hold the line" and prevent a "second round" of increases of retail prices may be wrecked by current upward spirals in materials prices, industrial purchasing agents disclosed here yesterday. New peaks in prices in copper, silver, pig iron, scrap, lead, hogs, beef, wheat, and other materials and supplies may bring serious repercussions through forcing repricing of manufactured products on a new high level in both the wholesale and retail trade, they said.

The price curve for many products is now beginning to look more like a repetition of the 1920 and 1929 patterns, leading purchasing executives revealed.

Large buyers of copper said that the latest rise of this commodity to 21.5 cents had particularly increased their apprehension about the danger of a further inflationary spiral. They said that the actual monthly deficiency of copper for domestic users is not less than 30,000 tons a month, and probably is closer to 50,000.

FOREIGN RELIEF DISCOUNTED

Prospects for relief through lowering the 4-cent tariff were said to be scanty, since foreign demand for copper has shown no signs of slackening despite reports of unsettled business conditions in England and Europe. Unless sellers of foreign copper have tonnage in reserve, available for sale to American buyers, domestic purchasing agents will have a hard time getting increased copper from foreign sources, they said. So far as is known, there are no large foreign reserve stocks available for purchase, they disclosed.

At 21½ cents, or at 23 or 25 cents, copper is getting into a price area in which an industrial buyer has got to be cautious, purchasing executives warned. The latest increase means that this metal has passed out of one general price area and into another in which, unless buyers stay "close to shore" and buy only for delivery in the next couple of months, they may get into trouble, it was said.

End products of copper, including wire and cable, have gone up in price, buyers disclosed. Several end product manufacturers are not only reflecting the advance in the price of the metal, but are also taking advantage of their position to increase certain products more than the percentage of increase in copper prices would warrant, they said. Weather-proof, magnet wire, and some bare and tin sizes of copper wire have advanced, they said. Because of scarce supplies, some manufacturers have apparently decided to make some money on their available materials, purchasing agents said.

URGE CHECK ON RISES

Raw materials, which have advanced during the past two weeks in fairly large jumps, represent a very substantial segment of the national economy, purchasing agents said. If they were in a position to do so, they said they would insist that somebody has got to stop excessive price rises some way very soon.

One way to meet this problem would be for some of the leading manufacturers to say that they simply cannot make their products at reasonable prices with raw materials spiraling upward from present levels, purchasing executives said. Acting on such a policy, they would cut off buying at present levels and merely sell from current inventories until prices dropped to lower levels, they said.

Some manufacturers in the metropolitan area already have adopted that policy. Lamp manufacturers, it was disclosed yesterday, have stopped buying cast-iron lamp bases in

quantities of 1,000 or 2,000 per order, and are now buying hand-to-mouth in quantities of 100 or 200 at a time. These orders have been cut back because of fear of a sudden price decline causing inventory losses, they said.

This is the time to keep calm, cool, and collected, the Bulletin of the National Association of Purchasing Agents released today advises industry. "Some commodity markets have gone completely haywire during the past few weeks * * * these price advances are bad medicine," it said.

[From the Washington Daily News of March 8, 1947]

DEMOCRACY BEGINS AT HOME

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Sometimes a case history is a good thing to show us some of the hard facts of life.

Here's one contained in a letter from Mississippi:

"I am a country merchant. My trade is made up wholly of Negro share croppers and other Negro farm workers. I am white and native of Mississippi. Both my grandfathers were slave owners. My father served 4 years in the Confederate Army. So if I am 'red' I am a native southern red.

"I am enclosing a fairly typical grocery list of a share-cropper family and comparative prices as between controlled prices last March 1 and uncontrolled prices this March 1. You will note the percentage increase to these farm families in their food cost is 74.

"It is not expected that anything will be done by the Government or otherwise to correct this gross injustice to the people involved by the removal of price control, because they are in the same position as the peasants of Russia, coolies of China, and peons of Mexico. They have no voice in government and fear to make protest."

He enclosed the following table:

	Controlled Mar. 1, 1946	Uncontrolled Mar. 1, 1947	In- crease
50 pounds flour.....	\$2.85	\$4.35	\$1.50
16 pounds lard.....	1.61	3.75	2.14
25 pounds meal.....	1.20	1.50	.30
1 gallon molasses.....	.80	1.25	.35
8 pounds meat (salt).....	1.76	3.20	1.44
1 pound coffee.....	.35	.50	.15
1 pound baking powder.....	.25	.25	.00
5 pounds beans.....	.50	.88	.38
5 pounds peas.....	.50	1.38	.88
6 cans salmon.....	1.20	2.34	1.14
5 pounds sugar.....	.35	.75	.40
5 pounds rice.....	.50	.75	.25
1 package washing powder.....	.26	.45	.19
5 bars soap.....	.50	.75	.25
Total.....	12.73	22.10	9.37

Typical monthly grocery list of share-cropper family of four to eight members.

Monthly cash furnish—\$20 to \$30.

The "furnish" is the allowance to the sharecropper which is deducted from his share of the crop in a settlement after the crop is harvested.

That's the story. At these prices, as can be seen, little or nothing is left over after the grocery bill is paid.

Back of all this is a human story, or many human stories, of how a segment of our population lives in these days of inflation, with prices for food at their peak. Prices have not gone down as was forecast during the feverish campaign which finally ended in abolition of price control. The few remnants of OPA, rent control, and rationing of sugar and rice, seem soon slated for extinction. The pinch, although worse for the sharecropper, is felt all along the line in other income groups, too. Demand has been raised in Congress for an investigation.

Price control was abolished as a "mandate" of the election as established national policy.

But this Mississippi story goes beyond inflation, bad as that is, and reveals, once again the denial of economic advantages and political rights to a part of our population. It dramatizes recent set-backs along the southern front, including reinstatement of the "white primary" in Georgia, Talmadgeism there and Bilboism in Mississippi, and an antilabor legislative drive in southern States.

We still have a job ahead of us in improving the democracy that we would like to spread elsewhere.

[From the New York Times of March 9, 1947]
HARVESTER WILL CUT PRICES BY \$20,000,000 A YEAR

CHICAGO, March 8.—The International Harvester Co. announced today it would put into effect before April 1 a series of price cuts that will save customers \$20,000,000 a year. The action is being taken, said Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board, because the company feels that all industry has been caught in a vicious circle of progressively rising prices, profits, and wages. He emphasized that neither consumer resistance to present prices nor competitive necessity entered into the price decision, and added:

"We believe strongly that the best way to distribute the gains of rising productivity is through lowering prices. We are cutting now, although there is every promise that we can sell everything we can make this year and next at present prices."

The price cut is the first made in the industry since before the war. Farm implement prices rose 25 percent in the war period.

Two increases of about 20 percent each were made last year and a 5-percent increase was made in 1941. The over-all increase is considerably less than the 62½ percent rise reported by the Government in the prices of all manufactured goods in the war period.

The \$20,000,000 price reductions will be spread over the four major product divisions, which are farm machines, tractors, motor trucks, and industrial power equipment.

Exempted from the cut are twine and fiber, on which prices were recently advanced, refrigeration equipment, a field recently entered by the company, and pig iron and steel, of which the company is not a major producer and of which it absorbs most of its own output.

New price schedules are now being drawn up and are expected to be made public in a few days.

The Harvester company action is the first important cut by a major manufacturer since the reductions announced by the Ford Motor Co. last January under which nine models were slashed \$15 to \$50 each.

Mr. McCormick said the considerations that led to Harvester's reductions were similar to those given by Henry Ford III. He emphasized, however, that there was one important difference in that the level of prices in Harvester's field had not risen nearly as much during the war as in the automobile industry.

Mr. McCormick said that the company is taking certain risks in cutting prices at this time. The decision, he said, is predicated on three probabilities: (1) That present wage negotiations with union labor will be settled on reasonable terms; (2) that production will not be interrupted by strikes; and (3) that Harvester will be able to continue to buy its material at present or lower prices.

After announcing the company's action and explaining the purposes behind it, Mr. McCormick told reporters that he believed that industry generally is confronted with a very difficult situation.

"The industry has been reluctant to cut prices despite the generally high level of profits because of the constant uncertainty over future wage rates and impossibility of predicting the course of profits if and when production falls off," he said and added:

"I think that we are compelled to seek a more flexible system of distributing the benefits of productivity. We are operating with enormous economic units—corporations on the one hand and unions on the other. Local and regional unions will not make a wage settlement until they know what national wage pattern will be determined by bargaining on a national basis in Washington or Pittsburgh.

"Each employer must wait until the national formula is fixed. He feels that he cannot risk cutting his own prices beforehand because he knows from experience that it is very difficult to raise prices once they have been cut. As a result we have lost the flexibility that we once enjoyed."

Mr. McCormick said that if industry is intelligent it will seek to work out a formula in which it again can distribute the benefits of high production and overcome the present rigidity in the economic system.

[From the New York Post of March 10, 1947]
FOOD PRICES UP 50 PERCENT WITHOUT OPA—
NAM'S PROMISE TO PUBLIC BROKEN

(By Henry Moscow)

"If OPA is permanently discontinued the production of goods will mount rapidly and through free competition prices will quickly adjust themselves to levels that consumers are willing to pay. * * * As production gets rolling again, supply will catch up with demand, prices will be fair and reasonable to all, quality will be improved * * * and America will enter the period of prosperity that everyone has been hoping for." National Association of Manufacturers, in a full page advertisement, July 3, 1946.

How has this prediction been substantiated?

The price of food has risen more than 50 percent since full OPA controls were removed June 30, 1946.

In dollars and cents—as translated by the Dun & Bradstreet wholesale price index—food that cost \$4.20, the day that OPA began to die piecemeal, cost \$4.52 2 days later, cost an all-time high of \$6.50 last February 20 and cost an even higher all-time high of \$6.77 on March 4.

There is no indication of an immediate decline or even of a leveling off.

Pork prices, for instance, already setting records, are expected to rise even further, increasing the demand—and the price—for beef.

"It's a consumer-producer victory over bureaucratic control. It must be expected that there will be erratic and fluctuating markets with higher prices but this will pass—probably by midwinter—as supplies increase."—the National Livestock Producers Association on October 14, 1946, after President Truman eliminated OPA meat price controls.

The extent of the consumer-producer victory is clarified by the following table comparing final OPA prices with levels current March 6, the last date for which the Department of Markets has released figures:

	Last OPA price	Mar. 6
Rib roast.....	\$0.48	\$0.59
Sirloin.....	.55	.73
Porterhouse.....	.64	.75
Pork loin roast.....	.43	.69
Pork loin chops.....	.48	.75
Veal loin chops.....	.48	.75
Veal cutlets.....	.50	.90

Pork chops have since risen in some markets to 85 cents, with dollar-a-pound pork chops in sight. Veal chops have hit 98 cents, veal cutlets \$1, porterhouse and sirloin steaks 85 cents in some shops, the department of markets reports.

The reason for the increase? Large consumer demand colliding with shrinking supplies—a situation foreseen by OPA's defend-

ers and offered by them as evidence of the need to continue controls.

Last fall's pig crop was off 11 percent because producers, uncertain of market trends, sold their breeding stock; now, lured by high prices, producers are selling lighter-than-usual animals and keeping larger-than-usual numbers for breeding.

Sheep and lamb production has been falling for 5 years, with last year's rate 34 percent below 1942's, partly because of decreasing demand for high-priced domestic wool.

"As conditions stand," says H. M. Conway, market analyst for the same National Livestock Producers Association that was so jubilant over the consumer-producer victory, "the supply of beef for the year will be very inadequate for the existing demand. This will tend to be greatly emphasized by the cyclical shortage of pork and lamb."

The National Livestock Producers Association, perhaps, is ready to eat its words of last October. It's a cinch the consumer can't afford to eat the association's meat.

"For many months representatives of the livestock and meat industry have insistently demanded the lifting of controls from their products. They have made the definite promise that the lifting of controls would bring to market the meat which our people want at reasonable prices. The American people will know where the responsibility rests if profiteering on meat raises prices so high that the average American cannot buy it."—President Truman, after decontrolling meat on October 14, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOW A NOTORIOUS INTERNATIONAL COMMUNIST DUPED OUR STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, in passing, and in alluding to the demonstration we have just had, and in reference to the full basket, please get the significance of the word "full," which was dumped on the laps of the Republican Party. I wish to state that you could not even get it half filled last June 30, the days, evidently, to which the lady from California wants to go back to. I notice also in that basket a loaf of bread. Good old bread, the staff of life. My, my, I doubt whether the lady from California wants to go back to June 30 when every housewife had to stand in line 6 hours a day for a loaf of bread and then most of the time not able to get it.

I noticed also in that basket some porterhouse steak. My, how the mouths of America watered at the very mention of the words "porterhouse steak" on June 30 of last year, the days to which the lady from California wants to go back. I do not think there are very many members of her own party who would go back to that.

I remember, June 30 of last year, how popular any man was who had a pair of nylon hosiery in his pocket and how the mobs of very gallant and brave ladies would follow him all over town and stage a riot. Remember those good old OPA days of June 1946? I remember the hosiery lines and the soap lines and the bread lines that we had on June 30 of last year. Has the lady from California so short a memory that she has forgotten so soon?

I do not think that the gentlewoman from California or the minority party wants to go back to those days. If they

do, I would challenge any member of her party, and I here now challenge the gentlewoman from California to introduce a bill to bring back the good old OPA days of June 30 of last year and see how far she would get with the people of America. She would not get to first base. The people last November told what they thought of OPA. That basket you notice is full. But on June 30 of last year you could not even get the basket to put the stuff in. So the demonstration that we have just had was very amusing. It was a good stage show, but it was not practical or a common-sense show, because there is not a single person in America outside of the gentlewoman from California, and perhaps a few more, who would go back to June 30, 1946, under Porter's OPA. He and his OPA practically ruined our economy in this country. We had bread lines and meat lines and butter lines and soap lines and lines of every nature. After he practically ruined the economy of our country he was sent to Greece to work on their economy. Now we are told we must send \$250,000,000 to bail the Greek people out and save their economy.

Here is the thing to remember about the show we just had. At least, the basket was full. On June 30 of last year you could not even get the basket and if you could get a basket you could not even get it half full and had to stand in line for hours to get it half full. No one wants to go back to that except the gentlewoman from California and Mr. Porter.

I issue a challenge here and now; I defy; I challenge; I implore the gentlewoman from California to introduce a bill to bring back the OPA of June 30, 1946, and see how far she would get with the members of her own party. That is the challenge and that is an answer to the demonstration and show we just witnessed. Last November the members of the gentlewoman from California's own party wished they never heard about June 30 of last year. They do not want to be reminded again.

Let us get back to more serious business, Mr. Speaker. I talked yesterday for a moment, but my time was limited, on the very serious tragedy facing the people of the world, in reference to the very timely statement of the President of the United States yesterday. I admire the President of the United States for making the statement he did regarding the necessity for our interference in the affairs of Greece and Turkey to save them from the onslaught of imperialistic communism. I was ready to go along with the President of the United States of America. I felt that he had given a very timely message. I felt that he said something that our President should have had the courage to say and do 2, 3, and 4 years ago. I was ready to go along with him. I am still ready to go along with him, but I am befuddled. I am just a little farm boy from Wisconsin and I am a little confused, because the message that was delivered to us yesterday by the President of the United States had serious impact the world over. There has not, I do not believe, been in the last 10 years a more important message to the people of the world

than that message delivered by the President of the United States of America on yesterday.

I was ready to go along with him because I came to the conclusion that the President had seen the danger ahead and had set the course for our Nation to follow—a unified course in which all the people of America could join to the fullest extent. That was my hope and fervent prayer. That speech was delivered, and the speech was a challenge that threw down the gauntlet, that from now on we are all through appeasing. In reality that is what he said. From now on we are going to stop the onslaught of communism on all freedom-loving people everywhere. We are going to stop it in Greece, we are going to stop it in Turkey, and we are all fed up with communistic tactics. That was the message from the Chief Executive of the United States, and for that purpose he said the Congress should appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop the onslaught of communism. I am willing and prepared to appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop the onslaughts of communism, but I do not want to appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey only to have some other agencies of our Government and some other representatives of our Government feeding those same Communists that we are supposed to stop in Greece and Turkey.

Yesterday we were asked to appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey. Yet the Assistant Secretary of State asks the Appropriations Committee of the House to authorize payment of the shipment of \$25,000,000 worth of power equipment, communications equipment, railroad supplies, farm equipment, tractors, and so forth, to Russia. Think of it. In that serious note that we had here yesterday our President asked us to appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and in Turkey, and the Assistant Secretary of State going before the House Appropriations Committee asking for an authorization to give \$25,000,000 of power equipment, farm equipment, and railroad equipment to Russia. My God. Is there any sense to that kind of a policy? Spending \$400,000,000 to stop communism and then our State Department recommending that we ship \$25,000,000 more to help communism. You think that is serious? Listen to this one. We are asked to appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and in Turkey and yet while that message was being made the American representative to UNRRA tells General Chiang Kai-shek that he has to divide goods which were sent under UNRRA with the Communists in China, which will give the Communists of China approximately \$75,000,000. So, while our President is asking for \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey, our Acting Secretary of State asks that we ship \$25,000,000 more to Russia, and the American head of UNRRA said we should give \$75,000,000 worth of clothing, food, and supplies to the Communists of China. My God, where are we going to come out? Feeding the Communists with one hand through our representative in UNRRA, and through our

State Department, and our Chief Executive coming here and telling us how important it is to stop communism.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield briefly.

Mr. BUFFETT. I do not think the gentleman should be so surprised. Ever since 1933 when this administration recognized communism, when they pardoned Earl Browder in 1940, and in sending Lend-lease after the war was over, and every other move they have made to encourage communism, it would be surprising if they did stop now.

Mr. O'KONSKI. What I want to know is this: Who are we Members of Congress to follow? Are we to follow the President of the United States and appropriate \$400,000,000 to stop communism, or are we to follow Acheson, the Assistant Secretary of State, and give Russia \$25,000,000 more in goods, or are we to follow Mr. Rooks, of UNRRA, and give the Chinese Communists \$75,000,000 more in relief goods? Which one of the three are we supposed to follow? Which one of the three are the American people supposed to follow?

I think—and I say this with no reflection on the courage of our President—I admire him for the statement he made yesterday. As I said before, it is too bad we did not demonstrate such courage in our leadership 2 or 3 or 4 years ago so that perhaps this thing would never have happened.

So I say this with no reflection on our President; but I think that before he came to Congress with his message he should have called in the members of the State Department, the American representatives on UNRRA, and told them that from now on we were walking a one-way street, one way ahead, that we were not going to walk both sides of the street or divide ourselves three different ways. That is the first thing he should have done before he came with his message to Congress. Then we would have known what to do; but as it is now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what to do. Should I vote to send \$400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey when at the same time UNRRA is aiding the Chinese Communists, when at the same time our State Department recommends that we send \$25,000,000 in farm equipment, power equipment, and railroad equipment to Russia? I cannot follow that policy. I, for one, am not going to vote a damned penny of the taxpayers' money to feed communism with one hand while trying to stop it with the other, because it just does not work. We have been walking both sides of the street too long, and walking both sides of the street is going to lead to very disastrous results, and the disaster may be that a year from now when the basket comes around there will not be anything in it at any price if we continue the course we are now pursuing.

But I want to talk to you about something else; I want to talk to you about how a notorious international Communist duped our State Department. It is the life story of Gustavo Duran. You talk about communism. My God, Mr. Speaker! We had as an assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in the

United States of America during the most trying period in our Nation's history one of the most notorious international Communists the world ever knew; a man by the name of Gustavo Duran, who was a leader in the Communist ranks in Spain, who was picked up by Mr. Braden of our State Department. It was secretly arranged so that he could become an American citizen in 6 weeks, and he was given a job as assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Braden, in charge of Latin-American relations. The thing I wanted to talk about, Mr. Speaker, was how this man, drawing \$8,000 a year salary from the taxpayers of the United States of America as assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State in Latin-American relations, how that man duped our State Department to where he gave the Communists a foothold in South America right under our very nose.

We do not have to go to Greece and Turkey to fight the danger of communism, we can go right to South America, where, due to the machinations of an employee of our State Department, drawing \$8,000 a year, a notorious, imported, international, alien Communist made at the convenience of the State Department a citizen of this country in 6 weeks, dictated the policies of Latin-American relations to the point where we were knifed out and the Communists came in.

I wish I had time to tell you the full import of the story in detail—his record, step by step; his Communist connections; his connections with the international Communist organization of the world, with its headquarters at Havana, Cuba, working through our State Department as his headquarters; how he worked with notorious CIO Communists in this country; how they started out on a campaign of smear against one of our southern neighbors, Argentina, and how that campaign of smear worked out; and how the CIO Communists in this country got together what they called a Blue Book, or a case against Argentina, in which they wanted to smear a friendly neighbor, Argentina. They were ready to distribute that Blue Book to the world, but through the machinations of Gustavo Duran he got the State Department to issue the infamous Blue Book that the CIO Communists of this country picked up and contrived; and as a result of that Blue Book issued in Argentina we have been knifed out and the Communists came in. They knifed us out because Gustavo Duran, as an agent of the Soviet Union and as an employee of our State Department, drawing eight grand a year of the taxpayers' money as an assistant to the Secretary of State, Spruille Braden, steered the policy of Latin-American relations. Mind you, a Communist placed in our State Department, right under our very noses, to steer the course of communism in South America.

As a result, our State Department issued this infamous Blue Book, which the CIO Communists in this country originally got up and were in the process of distributing, when they got our State Department to do it instead. They distributed it in the name of the State Department, without having it honestly

edited or even submitting it to the ministers or the proper authorities in this country. They issued the CIO infamous Blue Book in Argentina and immediately after it was issued the Communists changed their story. After they succeeded in their plot they said, "Look at those imperialistic Americans meddling in the affairs of Argentina. Is it not awful?" So today, in South America, the infamous Blue Book issued by our State Department is used as the basis for all Communist propaganda in South America. Every argument, every bit of poison that the communistic press in South America uses against the United States of America is taken from the pages of the infamous Blue Book engineered by an employee of the Department of State, an employee of the Secretary of State.

I hope the President sticks true to his course and I am behind him. I hope that he will get the other members of the Government behind him so that we will follow one road, a clear road, not Mr. Truman going down one road, Mr. Acheson going down another road, Mr. Rooks going down still another road. Let us get one road. Let the American people unite and not only drive communism out of Greece and out of Turkey, but let us drive communism out of Washington. Let us drive communism out of America. Let us drive communism out of South America. Let us make our own borders secure. You cannot fight communism by going to Greece and Turkey and doing it there alone. You have to fight communism throughout the world. You have to fight it most where it has been entrenched, and it has been entrenched in South America through the machinations of an employee of our State Department which I think is a sad reflection and a sad commentary on our Department of State when in the most trying times in our Nation's history they could not find a home-grown American to carry out our affairs and be an adviser on Latin-American relations. They had to go and pick up a notorious Communist in Spain, one of the most notorious Communists that the world has ever known, and make him within a period of 6 weeks' time a citizen of America so that he could become an assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State.

You would think that after the way Gustavo Duran had duped our State Department they would get wised up. Is Gustavo Duran an employee of the State Department now? No. Did they fire him? They kicked him upstairs to where, as a certain employee of the State Department said, he would not be abused. Do you know where Gustavo Duran is today? Gustavo Duran is the American representative on the United Nations Organization Refugee Committee. That is where he is today. That is the committee in which they want to place the fate of all these 800,000 refugees in Europe. What chance have those 800,000 refugees in Europe who went through the most bitter suffering and inhumanity that any people went through, what chance have they got with their fate in the hands of a man like Gustavo Duran and his ilk who represent the United States on the refugee

committee of the United Nations Organization? That is the story of Gustavo Duran, the man who duped our State Department.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FOREIGN RELIEF AND ECONOMIC AID

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'CONNOR] on a most illuminating, eloquent, and excellent address.

Mr. Speaker, in his message to the Congress yesterday the President of the United States said:

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures. I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. I believe that our help should be primarily through economic stability and orderly political processes.

Our Chief Executive also stated that—

The executive and legislative branches of the Government must work together.

In order to advance the President's policy by the cooperative action of the Congress, I have introduced a concurrent resolution which is designed to reduce the relief and economic needs of countries to which we are likely to bring relief and economic aid.

The sudden and alarming deterioration of affairs in the world at large and in Europe in particular requires, in the interests of the national safety, and in the cause of World Peace, that we review the entire international situation in order to clarify our position and determine the best use we can make of our great but not unlimited power.

If we are to assume the vastly increased responsibilities which this deterioration appears to require of us, we must not only define these responsibilities but decide for what purpose they are being undertaken.

That we, the richest country in the world, have a moral obligation toward suffering peoples is beyond question. Nevertheless, it is also true that while the American people are known to be charitable we also have a huge stake in averting world chaos. The two world wars in which we participated within the last 30 years furnish ample testimony on this point.

Accordingly, the financial burdens assumed and to be assumed by the American people must be regarded also as evidence of our effort to preserve peace by safeguarding the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

The relief and economic aid which we bring to these countries is, therefore, indicative not only of our belief in the essential brotherhood of man, but also of our desire to protect and enhance those principles for which we recently fought. In these circumstances it is appropriate that we consider relief aid, economic assistance, and foreign loans as inevitably involved, directly or indirectly, in the international settlements now contemplated by our Government.

We should not on the one hand add to the already heavy tax burden of the American people, and on the other hand increase that burden by making concessions to the very forces with which we appear to be in continual disagreement. If we are to shoulder these sudden fresh responsibilities, if we are to recognize by positive peacetime action that the frontiers of peace are as world-wide as the frontiers of war, if we are to assume the role of world leadership in the cause of peace to which our military and industrial predominance entitle us, then we must stand firm on the principles to which we and our allies in the war are pledged. We shall betray these principles if we participate in settlements which result in their surrender. We shall betray the American people if with one hand we call upon them for great sacrifices for these principles while with the other we sacrifice the principles themselves. We shall be doing exactly that if we participate in settlements which increase the relief and economic needs of countries to which we bring relief and economic aid.

The resolution which I have introduced today provides that these projected settlements should not be entered into to the extent that they increase the relief and economic needs of any countries to which we are likely to furnish relief and economic aid.

Mr. Speaker, the crisis of these strenuous times recalls to my mind a statement made by Winston Churchill to the British people shortly after the end of the recent war. He said:

You must be prepared for further effort of mind and body and further sacrifices to great causes if you are not to fall back into the rut of inertia, the confusion of aim, and the craven fear of being great.

We can well recall these words of exhortation today. This is indeed the time for greatness.

We are living in a period of continuing conflict in which the question of survival is as urgent as it was during the war recently concluded.

More than half a century ago Henry Adams, commenting on the failure of the Embargo Act to keep America from the contamination of war, said:

America began slowly to struggle, under the consciousness of pain, toward a conviction that she must bear the common burdens of humanity and fight with the weapons of other races in the same bloody arena; that she could not much longer delude herself with hopes of evading laws of nature and instincts of life; and that her new statesmanship which made peace a passion could lead to no better result than had been reached by the barbarous system which made war a duty.

The Embargo Act was passed 140 years ago. I need hardly point out the time-liness of this statement.

It is a truism to say that we are living in a moral crisis. It is a fact that we do not seem to realize it. We have a tendency to depend more on procedural machinery than on positive action to arrive at vital solutions.

If we can decide to view our present dilemma in this light, the true nature of the challenge will be clear. We shall then become aware of the relentless fact

that in spite of spectacular developments in lethal weapons, these weapons will still be set in motion by man-made impulses; we shall be impressed with the necessity for self-control rather than the control of armaments; we shall cease to be stampeded into trivial judgments and hysterical outbursts by the more recent discoveries of modern science; we shall come to the realization that even the atom bomb will move to the measure of men's thoughts.

The challenge, then, is the age-old challenge with which man has been confronted throughout all recorded history. The challenge of freedom and slavery. It is underlined, accentuated, and given a terrible urgency by the tremendous engines of destruction which we have fashioned. It is augmented and given international scope by virtue of modern scientific achievements. It is wonderfully true that a world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to be preserved.

In the larger sense the realization of our dilemma should make us take heart. If we ask ourselves the right questions we can eventually hope for some steady answers. When man can identify the challenge, he can take measures to meet it.

Now, of course, the challenge is not merely external. It is right here with us in our own country. Just as Hitler was thought by some to be a sort of antichrist, a symbol of our own sins, so it is quite possible that the Soviet brand of communism is in some part evidence of our own shortcomings. However that may be there is no question that a vigorous and united demonstration in this country that we believe in the private-property system as a basis for human rights, and that we appreciate our individual responsibilities more than these rights, will do much to reduce the danger of war. Such a demonstration could spread its beneficent contagion to the remote corners of the earth where the forces of despotism, darkness, and reaction are still rampant. To achieve this, however, we must supplement the negative opposition to communism with a positive extension of freedom. We must provide a constructive alternative to communism. But in the meantime—while mortal man attempts by sudden deeds of excellence to match the spectacular mechanical improvements of our age—we are faced with an immediate challenge beyond our borders which requires vision, courage, and the wisdom of Solomon.

We have seen in the course of the last 30 years that the world's wars are a matter for our deep concern. Our generation has lived in an almost continuous state of emergency in which the alarms outside our frontiers have had a tremendous impact upon the lives of our people. We have tried to learn our lesson. In the brief months which have elapsed since the termination of World War II, we have talked of one world as glibly, as enthusiastically, as we once spoke of the Monroe Doctrine. We have talked of it—yes—but I fear that we express our newly found internationalism rather in terms of financial and economic aid than by way of real involvement in the affairs of other

nations. We are now face to face with destiny.

Unless our interest in the affairs of other nations is of a purely charitable nature, it is time that we realized a few basic facts and thereby bring our understanding of our predicament in line with the preternatural power of the atom bomb.

First. Let us recognize once and for all that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Wars are but extensions of peacetime conflict—the final confession of man's inability to solve his differences by peaceful means. Accordingly, if we were justified in participating in the world's wars, we are at least as justified in participating in the world's peacetime conflicts.

Second. We must abandon the idea that we can oppose the disruptive forces now at large in the world without interfering in the internal affairs of other countries. We must interfere. We must interfere in order to bring relief and economic aid to those who need it rather than to those who do not and who use it to destroy the very principles which are still widely cherished. We must interfere in order that these nations shall not be a constant drain on our resources. We must interfere in order that we may rehabilitate rather than pauperize these destitute human beings. We must interfere in order to protect the American people from the use of their money in the cause of communism. More than \$2,000,000,000 in relief and economic aid have been extended since the war's end and largely through UNRRA. This money did much to strengthen the anti-freedom forces. It helped the very forces to which we are opposed. It assisted Communist and terrorist minorities to impose their will on freedom-loving majorities.

I am relieved that the administration has at last seen the error of its ways. I am happy that it has abandoned a policy of appeasement.

There is no question that the betrayal of Poland at Yalta, the help we have furnished to Tito, the hands-off policy in China, the uncontrolled expenditures of millions of the American taxpayers' dollars as well as many other incidents in the administration's confused approach to postwar problems have contributed to our present predicament. Had the administration been more decisive and clear-headed we might not now be confronted with this grave crisis. Let us hope that the discords and confusions of the past can provide the harmonies of the future. Let us face the actualities as they are presented to us by our President. We must do more than use the power of money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, we have been asked to "authorize the detail of American civilian and military personnel to Greece and Turkey, at the request of

those countries and for the purpose of supervising the use of such financial and material assistance as may be furnished." This means involvement. In order to bring this about, in order to shoulder these responsibilities, we must do more than simply export American dollars to relieve human distress. True charity means more than the writing of a check. True participation means more than financial and economic aid. Yet even the suggestion of money has inspired the remark that this would be followed by "demands that millions of our men be sent again to fight on foreign soil." May I suggest that if we are to do any fighting, it is infinitely preferable that we do it on foreign soil? Let us be clear-eyed about this and not delude ourselves as to the issue. You may be sure that the peoples outside our borders are not deluded. They are hard up against the issue in their daily lives. We cannot afford to be Victorian in our attitude toward war. We shall indulge such bogus refinements at our peril. We shall also betray the men and women who gave their lives in order that we might have more time to meet these portentous issues. Now that does not mean that we should be warmongers. In a nation of our demonstrated power, in a people of our mighty achievements, a show of truculence would be as unfitting as it is unnecessary. It does mean, however, that we should stop apologizing for our share in the recent war. It does mean that we must renounce the hope that we can prevent World War III by methods which failed to prevent World War II. It does mean that we should place our faith in the force of principle rather than in the power of appeasement. It does mean that we must bolster these principles not only by our industrial and military might but by a dynamic concept of our own convictions.

It is my profound belief that a peaceful accommodation can more easily be predicated on American strength than on American weakness. We can perhaps indulge the hope that self-assurance and firmness now will reveal the essential debility of communism. To quote from Abraham Lincoln:

In our intercourse with other nations it behooves us to be at once compromising and stern. If international understanding can be perpetuated by giving a little more and taking a little less, why then let us give a little more and take a little less. But never must we do all the giving. Rather in the case of a long and threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best.

We can work for the best through the good offices of the United Nations and we can best prepare for the worst by an abiding sense that until the United Nations has gathered vital momentum the choice for the world lies between a Pax Sovietica and a Pax Americana. This is the issue. This is the salient fact. This is the essential challenge of the hour.

We came near national suicide in 1940. Are we now ready to consign the rest of the world and ourselves along with it to the ash heap of a totalitarian subjugation which differs but little from that which recently engulfed millions of men? "There is a tide in the affairs of men

which taken at the flood leads on to fortune." Make no mistake about it. This is it. This is the tide. It is at the flood. The rest is up to us.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LEADERSHIP IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have all been disturbed by the Greek situation, and especially disturbed by the way these crises are suddenly brought before our people with the announcement that in about 24 hours we must put up \$400,000,000 as a starter to save the Mediterranean from becoming a Communist lake and save the British lines of communication to Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my very distinguished colleague from Connecticut that we must be realistic, and I am very realistic about this whole thing. The President's speech here yesterday did not reassure me, because it did not say enough. We talk about democracy being saved in Greece and Turkey. What has happened and what have we done to save democracy in Poland, in Latvia, in Estonia, in Yugoslavia, in Czechoslovakia, in Bulgaria, and in Rumania? We are coming in a little bit late to save democracy.

What I think the President should have told us, and what I believe he meant is that it is high time now to assume Britain's role in the world, to take on the imperial purple, to keep order, and to go out and do it ourselves. Let us tell our people just that, and if they want to do it let us go and do it. We can go to Greece and establish the same sort of military government that General MacArthur has so ably established in Japan. We can keep order, feed the population, stand watchdog in the Mediterranean. Then we shall probably have to proceed and do the same thing in Palestine, India, and every other place where Britain can no longer maintain order.

Mr. Speaker, if England wants us to do her job and our people want it, let us go the whole hog. Do not spend our money for Britain to police the world; spend it for the United States of America to police the world.

I do not notice that England is calling on the dominions to finance this noble effort. Canada is planning to cut her defenses 52 percent for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1948. That will be interesting to those people who think that the United States Navy needs 80,000 finger bowls to repel attack. Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa are not asked to save the world from communism. But we are; and our answer should be that we are going to put up or shut up, and that if we are to keep the world, and especially Europe, from going Communist, we are going to do it our way; we are going to spend our own money and send our own men under our own leaders. Otherwise, if communism is what Europe wants and she will not accept us on our own terms, we will get on the best we can with a Communist Europe, making it very clear that while we respect the opinions of others we are going to insist that they, in turn,

shall respect ours. We will not tolerate outside interference in our affairs or in the affairs of this hemisphere; and let us remember always that nothing is more barren and profitless than to bolster up weak puppet governments. In the end the strong will always prevail.

Let us be strong.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD two speeches, one entitled "The Closed Shop" and the second entitled "Industry-wide Bargaining."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1968. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

A meeting of the committee will be held Friday, March 14, at 10 o'clock a. m., to continue hearings on H. R. 1, etc.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, March 14, 1947.

Business to be considered: Executive session. Conference with officials of the Department of Commerce with respect to the Bureau of Standards, the Weather Bureau, and the Inland Waterways Corporation pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 18, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2109, a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; also public hearing on H. R. 2324, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on the following measures, with respect to war and emergency powers:

H. R. 1983, to amend the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended.

House Concurrent Resolution 5, to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941.

House Concurrent Resolution 9, to declare December 7, 1946, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in, and as the date of the termination of, the present war.

House Concurrent Resolution 25, to declare the date of termination of the wars in which the United States has been engaged since December 7, 1941.

House Joint Resolution 56, to terminate the emergency war powers of the President.

House Joint Resolution 128, to declare July 4, 1947, as the date of the cessation of hostilities in the present war.

House Concurrent Resolution 21, providing that various titles of the Second War Powers Act of 1942 shall remain in force until the day following the adoption of this resolution.

The hearings will be conducted in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

There will be a hearing before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary on Monday, March 17, 1947, on the following bills:

H. R. 1468, to provide for the review of certain orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the United States Maritime Commission and giving the United States courts of appeals jurisdiction on review to enjoin, set aside, or suspend such orders.

H. R. 1470, to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended.

The hearing will begin at 10:30 a. m., and will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., Monday, March 17, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearing of Members who have introduced bills which are pending before the committee.

COMMITTEE OF THE JUDICIARY

On Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 a. m., Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 120, H. R. 695, and H. R. 1888, to incorporate the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II. The hearings will be conducted in room 345, House Office Building.

On Wednesday, March 19, 1947, at 10:30 a. m., in room 346, Old House Office Building, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will begin hearings on the following measures with respect to holidays and celebrations:

H. R. 147 and H. R. 316, making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 1, House Joint Resolution 11, House Joint Resolution 23, House Joint Resolution 41, House Joint Resolution 63, House Joint Resolution 65, and Senate Joint Resolution 41, authorizing the President of the United States

of America to proclaim October 11, 1947, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

House Joint Resolution 31, providing for the observance of October 11, 1947, as General Pulaski Memorial Day.

House Joint Resolution 12, requesting the President to declare November 10, 1947, a day for the observance of the creation of the United States Marine Corps.

House Joint Resolution 15, designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week.

House Joint Resolution 20, designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading.

House Joint Resolution 35, designating the second Sunday of October of each year as Grandmother's Day.

House Joint Resolution 46, authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim April 19 of each year Patriots' Day, for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775.

House Joint Resolution 60, designating September 17 of each year as Constitution Day.

House Joint Resolution 64, designating February 11 of each year as Thomas Alva Edison Day.

House Joint Resolution 82, designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day.

House Joint Resolution 88, authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

House Joint Resolution 94, requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day.

House Joint Resolution 100, designating the first Sunday in June of each year as Shut-In's Day.

H. R. 1051, designating the first Monday of October in each year as National Farm Day and declaring such day a legal public holiday.

H. R. 1193, declaring August 14 of each year a legal holiday.

H. R. 1981, declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday.

H. R. 2085, designating the fourth Saturday in September of each year as American Indian Day.

H. R. 2333, declaring the birthday of Abraham Lincoln to be a legal holiday.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, at 10:30 a. m., on Friday, March 14, 1947, in the committee rooms, suite 356, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Public Lands on Saturday, March 15, 1947, at 10 o'clock, in room 1324, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1098, H. R. 1099, H. R. 1146, H. R. 1148, H. R. 1150, H. R. 1217, H. R. 1337, H. R. 1483, H. R. 1484, H. R. 1487,

H. R. 1539, H. R. 1727, H. R. 1784, H. R. 2353.

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Public Lands on Monday, March 17, 1947, at 10 o'clock in room 1324, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 1772, H. R. 1886, and H. R. 1997. This meeting is scheduled each day through Friday, March 21, 1947.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday and Friday, March 20 and 21, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearings on H. R. 873 and H. R. 1823, to create an Enemy Property Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday and Tuesday, March 24 and 25, 1947.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 2220, a bill to establish a National Aviation Council. Each witness is requested to furnish the clerk of the committee 5 copies of his direct statement in advance of the hearing and 45 additional copies at the time of his appearance, pursuant to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Ship Construction and Operation and Maritime Labor of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will meet in open hearings on Tuesday, March 18, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m. to consider H. R. 672, to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the city of St. Petersburg, Fla., for museum purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Lands on Friday, March 14, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 1324, New House Office Building, to consider H. R. 49, Hawaii statehood.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, March 19, 1947, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on H. R. 245, H. R. 674, and H. R. 1115 to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended. The hearings will be held in room 345, House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

On Wednesday, March 19, 1947, Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold hearings on the bill, H. R. 515, to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended (sections 7 and 11).

The hearings will be conducted in room 327, House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

454. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the procurement, promotion, and

elimination of Regular Army officers, and for other purposes, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 144. Resolution providing for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 118, a joint resolution to strengthen the common defense by maintaining an adequate domestic rubber-producing industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1564. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of July 24, 1946 (Public Law 534, 79th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2183. A bill providing for the conveyance to the city of Detroit, Mich., of that portion of the Fort Wayne Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. House Joint Resolution 116. Joint resolution to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.); without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. S. 231. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FLOESER:

H. R. 2535. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2536. A bill to provide for the procurement, promotion, and elimination of Regular Army officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2537. A bill to regulate the distribution, promotion, and retirement of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, to provide for the advancement of enlisted personnel to commissioned grades, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2538. A bill to authorize the crediting of moneys received from the disposition of serviceable Army Air Forces supplies, materials, and equipment other than surplus property, to the applicable current Army Air Forces appropriation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2539. A bill to reduce all individual income-tax payments one-twentieth by reducing the rate 5 percent on taxable incomes and to further reduce taxes for those with dependents by increasing the exemptions for a spouse and dependents from \$500 to \$700; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2540. A bill to require identification of Communist-front organizations to appear on matter sent or caused to be sent by or for them through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 2541. A bill to provide a deduction for income-tax purposes, of \$500 for funeral expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2542. A bill to make existing consumer credit regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System inapplicable to future consumer credit transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2543. A bill to repeal the Atomic Energy Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2544. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain immigrant inspectors and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 2545. A bill to provide funds for co-operation with the school board of the Mo-clips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Mo-clips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2546. A bill to amend section 96 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2547. A bill to amend the third paragraph of section 92 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2548. A bill to provide additional retirement benefits for certain persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2549. A bill relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to provide for the restoration and preservation of the Francis Scott Key mansion, to establish the Francis Scott Key National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution that the United States Government should withhold its participation in international settlements to the extent that such settlements directly or indirectly are likely substantially to increase the responsibilities of the United States by increasing the relief and economic needs of any country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2551. A bill for the relief of William R. Ramsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2552. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Hanley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2553. A bill for the relief of the estate of Matilda Faufata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2554. A bill for the relief of David K. Kaahili; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2555. A bill for the relief of the estate of Kisa Kagi-hara Hatate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORMAN:

H. R. 2557. A bill for the relief of Mable Gladys Vidulich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2558. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Tomaszewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2559. A bill for the relief of Nicholasde Lorence Pigulewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2560. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Hoffman and Jamina Maria Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2561. A bill for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2562. A bill for the relief of Julian Marymont; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2563. A bill for the relief of Maria and Zygmunt Kadzidowska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

188. By Mr. KEATING: Petition of students at the Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester, N. Y., urging passage of H. R. 870; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

189. By Mr. ROCKWELL: Memorial of the State of Colorado, with reference to request for extension of the present Commodity Credit Corporation purchase program to cover the entire 1947 domestic wool clip, and to enact such legislation as will provide a long-range price-stabilization plan for domestic wool; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

190. By Mr. TALLE: Petition of the Reverend M. C. Melcher and 57 other residents of Epworth, Iowa, requesting that the Congress prohibit the production, transportation, sale, and showing of motion-picture films which contribute to juvenile delinquency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1947

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 19, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers and our God, in the gloom of this troubled hour, disclose the brightness of Thy presence and revive within us the hope of our faith.

Deliver us from discouragement, and when we feel most helpless, make us turn to Thee for the answers Thou hast for every question. Enable us to see issues

clearly, before crisis clouds them, and help us to choose the good course, lest relying upon our own wisdom we have to choose between evils.

Give us the boldness of a faith that has conviction as well as sentiment, and take from us all fear save that of failing to do Thy will.

We ask in the name of Him who died for all men, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 12, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1240. An act to provide for the suspension of navigation and vessel-inspection laws, as applied to vessels operated by the War Department, upon the termination of title V, Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1327. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 1943. An act to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Specialist Corps in the Army;

H. R. 2404. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper; and

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution authorizing the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard to waive compliance with the navigation and vessel-inspection laws administered by the Coast Guard.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1968) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

THE LATE GOVERNOR OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Wisconsin congressional delegation and all the inhabitants of Wisconsin have been saddened by the loss of our great Governor, the Honorable Walter S. Goodland. Seldom has any man so firmly established himself in the hearts and minds of the people of the great Commonwealth of Wisconsin as did Walter S. Goodland, a leader completely and selflessly dedicated to the highest ideals of government.

His life and his career have become a part of the immortal legend of Wisconsin's history. His administration will serve as a landmark for many generations to come. All who knew him will continue to draw on the strength which was so vital a part of his own philosophy.

In thinking of Governor Goodland, I am reminded of the unforgettable tributes to men of his high caliber.

Edmund Burke once said:

Great men are the guideposts and landmarks of the state.